

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> LVIII. JANUARY 1890.

---

ART. I.—NEW TESTAMENT LEXICOGRAPHY.

1. *Novum Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum.*  
SCHLEUSNER. Ed. Quinta. (Glasguæ, 1817.)
2. *Lexicon Manuale Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti.* BRETSCHNEIDER. Ed. Tertia. (Lipsiæ, 1840.)
3. *Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament.* ROBINSON.  
New ed. (London, 1850.)
4. *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica.* WAHL. Ed. Tertia.  
(Lipsiæ, 1843.)
5. *Clavis Novi Testimenti Philologica.* WILKE. Ed. Se-  
cunda. (Lipsiæ, 1851.)
6. *Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti.*  
GRIMM. (Lipsiæ, 1868.)
7. *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek.*  
CREMER. (Edinburgh, 1878.)
8. Supplement to ditto. (Fourth German edition, 1886.)
9. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament;* being  
Grimm's and Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti* trans-  
lated, revised, and enlarged by JOSEPH HENRY  
THAYER, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament  
Criticism and Interpretation in the Divinity School of  
Harvard University. (Edinburgh, 1886.)
10. *Otium Norvicense. Pars Tertia. Notes on Select Passages*  
*of the Greek Testament, chiefly with reference to recent*  
*English Versions.* By FREDERICK FIELD, M.A., LL.D.,  
Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Ox-  
ford, 1881.)
11. *Essays in Biblical Greek.* By EDWIN HATCH, M.A., D.D.,  
Reader in Ecclesiastical History, Oxford. (Oxford,  
1889.)

A CONTEMPORARY scholar, who has devoted a considerable part  
of his life to the collection and editing of fragments of the  
VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII.

Greek comic poets, has included in his collection a portion of the sublime words of St. Paul in 2 Tim. iv. 6, 'I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my —' Here his extract ends. He finds that the first four words would make half an iambic tetrameter, and makes the remark that although they are 'ipsa nocte obscuriora,' they are manifestly the remnant of an iambic tetrameter, extracted (viz. by the grammarian in whom he finds them) from a comedy! This may serve as an illustration of the strangeness of the vocabulary of the Greek Testament to a purely classical scholar, although no doubt in this case it was not so much the word *σπένδομαι* itself as the figure involved, that proved such a stumbling-block. Hence the ordinary lexicons are entirely inadequate—it would hardly be too much to say, useless—to the student of the New Testament. Indeed, until recently they were of little use even to the student of Aristotle. There is a great gap between the vocabulary of Aristotle, and that, not merely of the dramatists, but even of Plato. But between Aristotle and St. Paul there is an interval of four centuries, as great as between Cicero and Jerome, or between Chaucer and Johnson. Besides the distance in time, which of itself would account for great difference in vocabulary, there is the difference in the circumstances of place and society to be taken into account. Connected with this is, of course, the influence of Hebrew habits of thought. This is, as far as the language is concerned, less than is sometimes supposed. Expressions characterized as Hebraisms may in not a few instances be paralleled in classical writers, the difference being in their frequency. As these Hebraisms, however, affect the phraseology more than the vocabulary, we shall not dwell on them.

There is another circumstance which must not be omitted. The writers of the New Testament were for the most part not literary persons, or authors by profession. St. Paul, indeed, had literary culture, but all his writings are letters written clearly without regard to literary form. Indeed, the Epistle to the Hebrews is the only piece of what may be called literary work in the whole volume. What should we have thought of some of even Cicero's Letters if they had dated from 300 A.D., and if Plautus had not survived to show that what appears novel is merely colloquial? We have no similar monument of colloquial Greek, and it is very curious that Cicero himself sometimes uses in his Letters a Greek expression which must have been familiar, and yet which we do not find in any classical Greek author. By the labours of many scholars the Greek of the New Testament has attained

its proper  
with a  
adapted  
same p  
our own  
applying  
gramma

The  
lexicog  
may ad  
a lexic  
the Gre  
with th  
New Te  
passion  
His sm  
Tertia  
the less

Crea  
as its  
particul  
Lexic  
edition  
ginal W  
student  
very mu  
plied ne  
referenc  
English  
for. Th  
Some a  
present  
of the C  
Som  
in the  
*Essays*  
to refer

1 We  
press,' th  
progress  
believe th  
is in a s  
publicatio  
them, fa  
author.

its proper recognition as a legitimate form of Hellenic speech, with a style and character and dignity of its own, perfectly adapted to its own purpose, and governed essentially by the same principles as other Hellenic speech. Commentators of our own day have shown that we gain rather than lose by applying to its interpretation the strictest rules of lexicon and grammar.

The latest and most important labourers in the field of lexicography are Grimm, Cremer, and Thayer, to whom we may add the name of Field, although he has not produced a lexicon. With him, as he says in his preface, 'the study of the Greek language and literature, especially in connexion with the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, has been not so much the *pursuit* as the *passion* of a life protracted far beyond the ordinary limits.' His small book, modestly entitled *Otium Norvicense: Pars Tertia*, is full of valuable observations and illustrations from the less read and later Greek authors.

Cremer's Lexicon does not aim at completeness. It is, as its title professes, a *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, and is particularly full and useful on theological terms. Grimm's Lexicon aims at completeness. It first appeared as a revised edition of Wilke's *Clavis*, in which, however, little of the original Wilke remained. Its value has been long known to students, and in Professor Thayer's translation this value is very much enhanced. Everywhere the Professor has supplied new matter of a most useful kind, including additional references to ancient authors, as well as to the most recent English and foreign works in which fresh light may be looked for. The readings of Westcott and Hort are carefully noted. Some articles have received large additions, e.g. *aiōv*. In its present form the book is simply indispensable to the student of the Greek Testament.

Some interesting studies in lexicography will be found in the second of Dr. Hatch's most interesting and valuable *Essays in Biblical Greek*. We shall have occasion presently to refer critically to some of his conclusions.<sup>1</sup>

The amount of the influence of the Septuagint Version on

<sup>1</sup> We regret to have to record, since these pages were passed 'for press,' that Dr. Hatch has been arrested by the hand of death in the progress of his many and laborious undertakings. We have reason to believe that the Concordance to the Septuagint in which he was engaged is in a state sufficiently advanced to admit readily of completion and publication. His Hibbert Lectures, however, or at any rate a portion of them, failed to receive final revision at the hands of their lamented author.

the language of the New Testament is very often exaggerated. It must be remembered that it was a translation for the most part very literal, although in some books frequently giving the sense rather than the literal rendering. The occurrence, therefore, of peculiarities in the use either of words or of phrases which result from the literal rendering of the Hebrew is no evidence of usage, nor does it, except in special cases, create a usage. Perhaps the best illustration of this is furnished by the English Bible itself, which, however, is by no means so literal as the Septuagint Version, and has exercised a far greater influence on the English language generally than the Greek Version is known to have exercised on any Greek dialect. Take, for example, the word 'peculiar' in 'peculiar people.' The Biblical use of the word has in no wise affected its significance; on the contrary, its ordinary sense has obscured its Biblical meaning, so that even professional theologians have frequently been misled by it to the perversion of the apostolic words; yet these theologians are supposed to have the original text at hand, and to be able to consult it, not to speak of the multitude of secondary aids which they possess. A similar remark applies to the word 'offend,' 'giving offence,' *i.e.* occasion of stumbling. This, which is almost exclusively the usage in the New Testament, never occurs in modern writers.

So with regard to phrases. 'Accept persons,' so common in the New Testament, is never used, although it has no exact equivalent. Rarely indeed have we met even professed students of theology who had any idea of the meaning of the words 'led captivity captive,' although the occurrence of the phrase in the Song of Deborah might have taught them that it simply meant 'led captive a body of captives.' The false interpretation suggested by the English idiom is even embodied in a hymn by Dr. Haweis, sung by many a congregation with a good meaning of its own no doubt, but without the slightest inkling of its Biblical meaning.

'Shadow of death' is another phrase to which we shall presently have to refer, adopted indeed from the Bible, but not in its Biblical signification. It is universally employed in the sense which it would have had if framed by our English authors. Similarly, 'to take God's name in vain' has become a current phrase, but the meaning it has in the Old Testament is entirely lost, even theologians often ignoring it. It means, we need hardly say, 'to swear falsely.'

Nor has the English Bible been able to preserve either words or significations once current from disappearing. A

notab  
it is  
'dam  
less in  
Septu  
of th  
Psalm  
word  
Testa  
εὐδοκ  
except  
'rene  
'cons  
psalm  
and t  
has r  
nishi  
ρῆμα  
Testa  
into  
In th  
New  
Septu  
πρόστ  
A

Thay  
New  
first  
It co  
the S  
these  
word  
and  
A.D.  
list).  
one-f  
these  
show  
total  
occu  
furnis  
quota  
exam  
nume

notable example is 'quick' in the sense of 'living,' although it is not only in the Bible but in the Creed. 'Hell' and 'damn' are other important examples; the number of those less important is very great. For our part, when we read the Septuagint what strikes us is its unlikeness to the language of the New Testament. Taking as one example the 51st Psalm, which must have been very familiar, and noting only words which might easily have found a place in the New Testament, we have ἀνόμημα, ἀκούτζω, ἀνταναρέω, ἀγαθίνω, εὐδοκέω with an accusative (not in the New Testament, except in a quotation from this psalm), ἐγκαυτίζω in the sense 'renew,' while in the New Testament it has only the sense 'consecrate' or 'inaugurate.' Glancing at the preceding psalm (50), we find in one verse (19) περιπλέκω, δολιστης, and the verb πλεονάζω, 'to increase,' a signification which it has not in the New Testament. Similar instances are furnished by nearly every page. Then as to phrases: ποιεῖν ῥῆμα is common in the LXX, but never occurs in the New Testament. Λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον is a phrase which has got into use from the LXX, but not in the LXX signification. In the Old Testament it means simply 'to show favour'; in the New 'to show partiality.' The phrase was adopted from the Septuagint, but not the meaning, which was apparently determined by the influence of the common Greek use of πρόσωπον as a character assumed.

Amongst the very useful tables appended to Professor Thayer's Lexicon is a list of Post-Aristotelian words in the New Testament. This list does not include the words which first made their appearance between B.C. 150 and B.C. 100. It contains 318 words, of which only fifteen are found in the Septuagint (or Apocrypha), and none are confined to these. Another list is of 'Biblical Words.' This includes words which first appeared in secular authors between B.C. 150 and B.C. 100, as well as those which first appeared between A.D. 50 and A.D. 100 (these [76] are also in the former list). This list includes 767 words, of which only 191, just one-fourth, are found in the Septuagint; but about half of these are in other writers also, as the body of the Lexicon shows. A third table is of 'Biblical Significations.' The total number is 375, of which only 160, or less than half, occur in the Septuagint (including the Apocrypha, which furnishes 20). Several of these instances, moreover, are only quotations from the Septuagint. On the other hand, if we examine the vocabulary of the New Testament we find numerous words and significations not included in these lists,

and not found in the Septuagint. For example, *βαστάζω*, found twenty-seven times in the New Testament, occurs twice in the Apocrypha, and once only in the version of canonical books. The same is the case with *βέβαιος*. *Βαρέω* is not either in Septuagint or Apocrypha, nor *βραδύς*, *βραδύνω*, or *βραδυτής*. *Ἄτελος* occurs once in the Apocrypha, not elsewhere; *ἄιδης* never.

*Ἀγάπη* is worth dwelling on for a moment. This is a peculiarly Biblical word, not found in profane authors (except once in Philo), although they use the verb *ἀγαπάω*, from which we may infer that the substantive must have been at one time in use. However, the substantive in actual use was the verbal derivative *ἀγάπησις*. *Ἀγάπη* is specially appropriated in the New Testament to what Aristotle calls *φιλία ἀνεν πάθους καὶ τὸν στέργειν*,<sup>1</sup> and accordingly is applied to the love of God, and to God, as well as to the love to one another which is a duty but does not include affection. There is no trace of this in the Septuagint. The word occurs there in all fifteen times, of which two are in Ecclesiastes and eleven in Canticles. Of the remaining passages one is 2 Sam. xiii. 15 (Amnon and Tamar), where it applies to sexual love, and the other Jer. ii. 2. The classical word *ἀγάπησις* occurs in about five places, and in four of these it expresses what in the New Testament is *ἀγάπη*. In the fifth passage (1 Sam. i. 26) it occurs twice, 'Thy love for me was wonderful, passing the love of women.' Now if the Septuagint usage had been the guide, *ἀγάπησις*, and not *ἀγάπη*, would have been the word adopted. The verb *ἀγαπάω*, it may be observed, is used of sexual love in the Septuagint, as well as occasionally in later writers. Professor Thayer, correcting Grimm, who says it cannot be so used, refers (under *φιλέω*) to two passages in Plutarch where it is so used, but has not observed that it also occurs in the Septuagint, e. gr. 1 Kings xi. 2; Hosea iii. 1; Is. lvii. 8; Ezek. xvi. 37. A third word for love, *φιλία*, is found six times in the Book of Proverbs (in two of which it is sexual love), and only once in the New Testament (James iv. 4, 'friendship of the world'). The word *ὑπομονὴ*, again, so familiar as the name of a Christian virtue, although occurring in the Septuagint, has there an entirely different meaning, viz. 'expectation.' *Αφεσις*, a regular term in the New Testament for 'remission' of sins, never has that sense in the Septuagint. It means 'release, dismissal,' a sense which in the New Testament it has only in a quotation.

Again, the technical sense of *κοινός*, 'common or unclean,'

<sup>1</sup> Eth. Nic. IV. vi. 5.

is one which might be supposed to have been peculiarly Hellenistic. But it is not found in the canonical books, where, indeed, the word itself occurs but twice, and with the significance 'in common.' The New Testament sense appears, indeed, twice in the First Book of the Maccabees. The verb *κοινώω* does not occur at all. *Κατακρίνω*, again, occurs once only in the canonical books, viz. in Esther. But we need not multiply these illustrations. The instances we have selected are of words which there was occasion for using.

Such facts as these show that the influence of the Septuagint version on the vocabulary of the New Testament was not predominant, and that to make the usage of the former determine the interpretation of the latter, except in the case of terms of Hebrew theology, is quite out of the question.

It will be seen from what we have said that we cannot agree with Dr. Hatch that the fact of the Septuagint or other Greek translators rendering a Hebrew word generally or even uniformly by a certain Greek word is a proof that the meaning of the latter is the same as that of the former. An example or two will best show the grounds for our hesitation. The first we take is the word *ὑποκριτής*. This is used by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion as a rendering of the Hebrew word נָמָר, which means 'impious,' and which the Septuagint translators had rendered by *ἀσεβής*, or the like. Dr. Hatch thinks that 'these facts seem to show that early in the second century, and among Greek-speaking Jews, *ὑποκριτής* had come to mean more than merely "the actor of a false part in life." It connoted positive badness.' And he proceeds to say that this sense seems more appropriate than any other in certain passages of the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. xxiv. 51; xxiii. 28; Mark xii. 15). But Jerome also renders the Hebrew word by 'hypocrite' as the Authorized Version does by 'hypocrite,' yet it would hardly be said that these words must therefore be synonymous with the Hebrew. The explanation is simply this: in the later Hebrew the word did mean 'hypocrite,' and this meaning passed even into Hebrew lexicons, in some of which it appears to the present day. And this accounts for the fact that the Hexapla translators thought proper to change the Septuagint rendering *ἀσεβής* for what seemed to them, not a synonymous word, but the true meaning of the Hebrew. As to the New Testament, surely in Matt. xxiii. it is not simply badness or impiety of the Pharisees that is denounced, but the inconsistency of their punctilious observance of small matters and neglect of the more essential. In fact the verses describe the very type of hypo-

crisy. And in Mark xii. 15, 'knowing their hypocrisy,' the parallels *πανουργία* in Luke and *πονηρία* in Matthew do not prove that *ὑπόκρισις* has lost its special meaning. The question referred to was essentially hypocritical. St. Luke's *πανουργία*, which is rather 'knavishness' than 'malice,' indicates the same thing; but though the three words were all applicable, they are not synonymous. The question being hypocritically put, the conduct of the questioners might be called more generally knavishness, and still more generally wickedness.

Not very dissimilar is the case of *δικαιοσύνη*. According to Dr. Hatch, while the classical meaning of this word is found both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, there is intertwined with it another meaning which is peculiar to Hellenistic Greek, viz. kindness, *ἀλεημοσύνη*. In fact 'the meanings of the two words *δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀλεημοσύνη* had interpenetrated each other.' This inference is based on the fact that the word for 'kindness' (*רַחֲם*) usually (*i.e.* more than one hundred times) rendered by *ἀλεος* or the like, is nine times rendered by *δικαιοσύνη* and once by *δίκαιος*, while the word *דִּקְרָא*, 'justice,' usually rendered by *δικαιοσύնη*, is nine times translated *ἀλεημοσύնη* and three times *ἀλεος*. Here again it is in the Hebrew that we find the explanation of the facts. In the later Hebrew *רַחֲמָה* means 'almsgiving.' Thus it is said, 'He that doeth righteousness [*i.e.* giveth alms] in secret is greater than Moses.' The transition of meaning is analogous to that of our own word 'charity.' What the Septuagint translation proves is, not that the Greek word *ἀλεημοσύնη* had changed its meaning, but that this notion was attached to the Hebrew word even in their day. Indeed, some interpreters have thought that it was used in the sense of 'liberality' or 'kindness' in the Hebrew text itself, *e.g.* Prov. x. 2; xi. 5.

As to the rendering of the word *רַחֲם*, it is to be observed that this word means not only 'kindness,' but 'piety' or 'godliness.' The adjective connected with it is the regular word for 'saints.' In Is. lvii. 1, 'men of "chesed"' is actually synonymous with 'righteous.' 'The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart, and "men of piety" are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come.' Here the LXX have *δίκαιος* three times, quite correctly as to sense. The English Version has 'merciful men' (Revised Version, margin, 'godly'), but the last clause makes it evident that the meaning is 'righteous.' In Hosea vi. 5 we have a similar use of the word: 'O Ephraim, what

shall I do unto thee? O Judah, what shall I do unto thee? for your "goodness" is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew it goeth away.' Here the LXX wrongly have ἔλεος. (Compare Prov. xxi. 21.) In 2 Chron. vi. 42, xxxii. 32, the good deeds of David and Hezekiah are called by the same word. In Ps. ci. 1, the Psalmist says he will sing of 'chesed' and judgment. Now he sings of righteousness and judgment; there is not a word of 'mercy.' In Prov. xx. 28 it is said that the king's throne is uphelden by 'chesed,' and, in the former part of the verse, that he is preserved by 'chesed' and truth. Elsewhere often it is said that the king's throne is established by righteousness (as in Prov. xxv. 5).

These examples show that the rendering occasionally adopted by the LXX can be accounted for by the connotation of the Hebrew word, without having recourse to the supposition that the Greek word had put on a new meaning. This is confirmed by the fact that the subsequent Greek translators give no hint of such a meaning of the Greek. This circumstance has, indeed, induced Dr. Hatch to suggest that it was a local peculiarity.

There is one passage in the New Testament in which Dr. Hatch thinks the above-mentioned meaning of δίκαιοσύνη 'is so clear that scribes who were unaware of its existence altered the text'—viz. Matt. vi. 1, where the genuine reading is δίκαιοινη. It appears to us much better, with Fritzsche and Meyer, to suppose that ver. 1 gives a general precept, which is then applied in particular to almsgiving (ver. 2), to prayer (ver. 5), and to fasting (ver. 16). Copyists, not seeing this, thought that ver. 1 was equivalent to ver. 2, and changed the word.

Dr. Hatch on similar grounds interprets the adjective δίκαιος in Matt. i. 19 as 'kindly'—'Joseph being a kindly man.' Now there is still less reason for supposing such a transition of meaning in the adjective than in the substantive; but Dr. Hatch is so far right in his conclusion that δίκαιος is not to be pressed as meaning 'severely just.' It is often 'fair, good.' Of this we have instances in classical writers, who use it of a good physician, a good chariot, good land, &c. In the New Testament (1 John i. 9) πιστὸς καὶ δίκαιος, 'faithful and just,' it certainly does not mean 'exacting what justice requires,' nor even 'giving what has been deserved.' In Matt. v. 45 'the just and the unjust' = 'the evil and the good.' In Matt. xiii. 4, 7 it is 'whatever is fair ye shall receive.' Joseph of Arimathea, also, is said to have been 'just and good.' In Rom. v. 7 it seems to be used synony-

mously with ἀγαθός, as in the passage of St. Matthew just quoted—‘ Hardly for a righteous man will one die, [hardly, I say.] for perhaps for such a man one might die.’ The attempts to make a contrast here have not succeeded. Δίκαιος nowhere appears as contrasted with ἀγαθός.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Hatch endeavours to prove that ἀρετὴ had in the LXX the meaning ‘praise,’ and he regards this as the most appropriate sense in Phil. iv. 8. His inference is founded on the fact that the word is used in the Septuagint four times (in Isaiah) where the Hebrew has ‘praises (*tehilloth*) of God,’ and twice similarly for ‘glory.’ Now it must be observed that in the places referred to, if we give ἀρετὴ its usual signification, we obtain a correct interpretation of the Hebrew, which would not be the case had αἰνεσίς or ἔπαινος been used, which do not admit the figurative sense of the Latin ‘laus.’ Indeed, in Ps. ix. 14, where the former word is similarly employed, Schleusner interprets it ‘laudes, h.e. facta insignia ac laude digna.’ And in Is. lixiii. 7—‘ I will make mention of the lovingkindnesses of the Lord and the praises of the Lord . . . and the great goodness . . . which he hath bestowed ’—all the modern interpreters whom we have at hand, including Bredenkamp, Cheyne, Delitzsch, and Knobel, interpret the Hebrew word as =‘deeds of renown’ or the like. This is the natural interpretation wherever the declaring or showing forth of God’s ‘praises’ is mentioned, e.g. Is. xlivi. 21, ‘My people whom I acquired to relate my praises.’ In Hab. iii. 3, where ἀρετὴ=‘glory’ (E.V.), it is not praise but manifested glory that is said to cover the heavens. In the same verse the word for ‘praise’ is rendered αἰνεσίς. If ἀρετὴ here and elsewhere is to be translated ‘praise,’ then we must explain this ‘praise’ as figuratively =‘excellence’ or ‘perfection’=ἀρετὴ. These passages, then, do not support Dr. Hatch’s idea. On the other hand, we have the fact that where praise in the literal sense is meant ἀρετὴ is not used; and further it is to be noted that the later translators, wishing to adhere more closely to the letter of the Hebrew, have substituted for ἀρετὴ words which do signify ‘praise,’ showing that they did not regard ἀρετὴ as expressing this meaning. But if we laid much stress on this it would seem to imply that some case had been made for Dr. Hatch’s view, which we do not admit. If, however, ἀρετὴ is understood to be =‘recognized excellence,’ this is a classical not a Hellenistic

<sup>1</sup> Plato supplies an admirable illustration of this: ὁ δίκαιος ἡμῖν ἀναπέφανται δων ἀγαθός τε καὶ σοφός (*Rep.* 350 c). This might be taken as a definition.

use of the word. Indeed, according to many lexicographers, even 'fame' or 'glory' is a classical signification. But we are not prepared to maintain this, although in doing so we might appeal to Liddell and Scott.

There are other suggestions of Dr. Hatch which impress us more favourably: for example, his interpretation of *πειρασμός* as = 'trial,' i.e. 'tribulation, affliction,' a signification which is, indeed, recognized once in the Authorized Version (1 Pet. iv. 12), and oftener in the Revised (Acts xx. 19, text; Rev. iii. 10, text; Jas. i. 2, margin; 1 Pet. i. 6, margin), and which might well have been adopted also in St. Luke viii. 13. Dr. Hatch would adopt this sense also in the Lord's Prayer, and a similar sense for the verb in Heb. iv. 15, as well as in St. Matt. iv. 1 and the parallels.

A group of words discussed by Dr. Hatch in illustration of his principles is *πένης*, *πραΐς*, *πτωχός*, and *ταπεινός*. These words, he says, 'are in the LXX so constantly interchanged as to exclude the possibility of any sharp distinction between them.' We shall not controvert this as regards *πένης* and *πτωχός*, but the fact only supplies another instance of the difference between the vocabulary of the LXX and that of the New Testament; for *πένης* does not enter the latter at all (its one occurrence being in a quotation), and *πτωχός* retains its distinctive signification.

The word which interests us, however, is *πραΐς*, which, according to Dr. Hatch, is used 'interchangeably' with the other three to render the Hebrew words '*āni*', 'afflicted,' and '*ānâv*', 'meek.' Such interchange would seem rather to prove that the translators did not properly distinguish the Hebrew words than that they confounded the Greek. But in fact it is not possible to draw such a sharp distinction between these two Hebrew words except on the assumption that we are free to alter the Hebrew text in accordance with it—an assumption which, however admissible in itself, would be fatal to Dr. Hatch's inference, which requires that the LXX should have had the same reading that we have. The ordinary lexicons assign both meanings to both words, and with the present text this is unavoidable. Indeed, Böttcher regards the words as identical, '*ānâv*' being only an archaic and poetic form. However, the graphical difference between the words is so slight that they are very liable to be confounded, and, in fact, the Massorah indicates several places in which they have been mistaken one for the other. It is curious that Dr. Hatch cites indifferently the textual and marginal readings of such passages. Thus he states that '*ānâv*' is rendered *πτωχός* in

Prov. xiv. 21, and *ταπεινός* in Prov. iii. 34, whereas in both passages the text has '*āni*'. Again, he states that '*āni*' is rendered *πταις* in Job xxiv. 4, *πένης* in Ps. ix. 19, and *ταπεινός* in Is. xxxii. 7, in all which cases the textual reading is '*ānāv*'. On the other hand, in Ps. ix. 13 (quoted for '*āni* = *πένης*') the marginal reading is '*ānāv*'.<sup>1</sup>

These notes of the Massorah show that in very early times the words were believed to have been sometimes confounded; and either their meanings were interchanged or this confusion occurred in other instances not mentioned in the Massorah. The former supposition is expressly adopted by some lexicographers, e.g. Fürst, but the latter is perhaps preferable. One such passage is Zech. ix. 9: 'Behold, thy King cometh unto thee . . . lowly and riding upon an ass.' Here the text has '*āni*', without any marginal correction, but the sense is doubtless that given in the Authorised Version and retained in the Revised. The Targum, moreover, renders 'lowly' here, as also in Zeph. iii. 12 and Is. xlvi. 13. Another instance in which the same sense is required is Is. lxvi. 2: 'To this man will I look, even to him that is lowly and of a contrite spirit.' Here again the Targum has 'lowly' (E. V. 'poor,' LXX *ταπεινός*). On the other hand, in several instances where '*ānāv*' is read 'poor' suits the connexion better than 'meek,' e.g. Is. lxi. 1. In Ps. x. 17 several manuscripts actually read '*āni*'. In these circumstances it seems clear that no inference can be drawn as to the signification attached to the Greek words by the translators who used them to render either Hebrew word. But at least before drawing such an inference we ought to examine the passages more closely, in order to see whether the LXX may not have had some good reason for varying their rendering. Now as to *πταις*. There are just three passages alleged by Dr. Hatch in which it is used to translate '*āni*' (properly = 'afflicted,' 'poor'), viz. Job xxiv. 4, Zech. ix. 9, and Is. xxvi. 6. In the first of these, as we have just mentioned, the reading of even our present text is not '*āni*'; in the second translators and lexicographers agree with the interpretation of the LXX. Either the translator of Zechariah read '*ānāv*', or, like the moderns, he judged that '*āni*' was here used in the sense of '*ānāv*'. The agreement of the Targum would of itself put out of the question the supposition of a peculiarly Greek mistake; but indeed the appropriateness of

<sup>1</sup> In Amos ii. 7, cited as an instance of '*āni* = *ταπεινός*', the word in the text is '*ānāv*', with no marginal variation. Dr. Hatch has probably been misled by Trommius, as Trommius was by Kircher. Another instance of the confusion of the two words.

the rendering proves that the Greek translator did not choose *πραΰς* at random or confound it with *πένης*. There remains one passage in which '*ἀνί*' is rendered *πραΰς* when *πένης* would have been better. Even if this were an undeniable error, still the fact that out of eighty occurrences of '*ἀνί*' it is once by an indifferent translator wrongly rendered would be but a slender basis on which to build a theory as to the accepted signification of the Greek word, or its use in the New Testament. But, as we have seen, the rendering is defensible, and, what is more the Targum actually agrees with the rendering *πραΰς*. Thus of Dr. Hatch's three passages one is not a case of '*ἀνί*' at all, in the second *πραΰς* has beyond question its usual meaning and is the correct rendering, and in the third all that can be said is that it is not the best translation. Surely the fact that of the many translators whom we group as the LXX one only falls into this error (if it be one) is decisive proof that the distinction between *πένης* and *πραΰς* was in no degree obscured.<sup>1</sup>

As to the instances in which *πένης* or *πτωχός* is used to translate '*ἀνδεύ*', an examination will show that these words have not been chosen at random, or because they were not distinguished from *πραΰς*—for example, Ps. xxi. 27, 'The poor shall eat and shall be satisfied.' In Is. xxix. 19 the parallel clause has '*ebhjōn*', 'needy.' Again, in Is. lxi. 1, 'to preach good tidings to the poor.' In these places 'poor' suits the sense better than 'meek.' We may add Ps. x. 17, where, as already remarked, several MSS. read '*ἀνί*', and Ps. lxix. 33. In all these places the rendering is at least quite suitable, and if the true reading is not '*ἀνί*', then '*ἀνδεύ*' means 'oppressed, afflicted.' Indeed, Gesenius assigns this as the first meaning of the word, duly remarking that the accessory notion of humility or weakness is always included. He gives the simple meaning 'meek' to the word in one passage only, viz. Numb. xii. 3. In Prov. xiv. 21, where the sense requires 'poor' ('he that hath pity on the poor') and the text has '*ἀνί*', the margin substitutes '*ἀνδεύ*', showing that the ancient Sopherim did not make a very sharp distinction between the words, if indeed they regarded them as more than different forms of the same

<sup>1</sup> It deserves to be noticed that in this place, as well as in Is. lxi. 2, where Aquila has *πραῦν*, which the sense requires, in Ps. xviii. 28, where Symmachus has *πράον*, which agrees with the parallel clause, and in Zech. ix. 9, '*ἀνί*' is singular. Now '*ἀνδεύ*' occurs in the singular once only, and there it is altered by the margin. Either the singular went out of use and '*ἀνί*' was used instead of it, or it was strange to the copyists, who substituted '*ἀνί*'.

word. As to *ταπεινός*, this is used by classical writers, both with reference to condition and to character, and not always with a suggestion of moral disparagement.<sup>1</sup> The translators, therefore, were perfectly justified in employing it for either Hebrew word (and for other similar words) if they saw fit. The translator of the Psalms was doubtless right in using it for 'āni in Ps. xviii. 27, where the antithetic parallelism has 'high looks,' as was also the translator of Isaiah in lxvi. 2, where the word is coupled with 'a contrite spirit.'

That the same class of persons is designated, in the later books at least, by 'āni, 'āndāv, and 'ebhjōn, is probable; but we see no reason for believing, with Dr. Hatch, that this class was 'the peasantry or *fellahin* who then, as now, for the most part lived quiet and religious lives, but who were the victims of constant ill-treatment and plunder at the hands not only of tyrannical rulers, but also of powerful and lawless neighbours.' The conjecture of Graetz is more probable that they were the poor pious Levites, who, from their dependent position, when religion decayed or idolatry prevailed, would be liable to be brought to poverty by their faithfulness and piety.

Dr. Hatch, again, infers a close similarity of meaning between *θυσία* and *δῶρον*, from the fact that both words are used to render the Hebrew *minchah*. But the Hebrew word is used both of offerings to God and of gifts or tribute to men, and the Greek translators very properly varied their rendering accordingly, as the English translators have also done, sometimes translating the word 'gift' and sometimes 'offering.' Is this evidence that the translators in either case ignored the distinction between the words they used? Does Dr. Hatch really think that the Greek translators would have shown a more exact appreciation of the meaning of the Greek words if they had used *θυσία* where a gift to men was spoken of, or *δῶρον* where an offering to God was in question? Surely in order to obtain any useful result in such inquiries we must have some regard to the possible varieties of meaning of the Hebrew word.

Another thing which we must take into account is that we are not dealing with the work of a single translator, but with a work executed by different persons at different times. This is illustrated by another of Dr. Hatch's examples, the pair of words *παραβολὴ* and *παρούμα*, the former properly 'a similitude,' the latter 'a proverbial illustration.' Having referred to the passages in which these words occur, he says,

<sup>1</sup> For example, Plato, *Legg.* 716 A, and Demosthenes in *Midiam*, § 186. In the latter passage it appears from the context to be =*μέτριος*.

'These facts, that *παραβολὴ* and *παροιμία* are used by the LXX to translate the same Hebrew word, and that the other translators and revisers frequently substitute the one for the other, show that between the two words there existed a close relationship, and that the sharp distinction which has been sometimes drawn between them does not hold in the Greek versions of the O.T., or, as he expresses it afterwards, 'that they were convertible terms, or at least that their meanings were so closely allied that one could be substituted for the other.' Now if it were the case that these words were used indifferently by the same translator as the rendering of the Hebrew word (*mâshâl*) in the same sense, then there might be some ground for the inference, assuming (a pretty strong assumption) that the translator was a master of his art. But let us look into the facts. The word *mâshâl* has more than one meaning. Gesenius gives it the following significations : '1, a similitude, parable ; 2, a sententious saying, γνώμη, or apophthegm ; 3, a proverb, *παροιμία* ; 4, a poem, song, verse, especially of prophecy, or a didactic discourse or poem, comparing the Arabic *mathal*, 'parable,' 'fable,' 'sentence,' but in the plural 'verses.' Hence the word might, according to circumstances, be rendered *παραβολὴ*, *παροιμία*, φῶη, θρῆνος. But it is characteristic of second-rate translators that instead of correctly representing the varying significations, or rather shades of meaning, of a word like this, they adhere to a stereotyped rendering. The English translators, notwithstanding their love of variety, illustrate this in the case of this very word. They vary indeed between 'parable' and 'proverb,' but they use both words where they are not suitable. Indeed, they may be fairly said to use them 'interchangeably,' since 'take up a proverb' in Is. xiv. 4, Hab. ii. 6 is equivalent to 'take up a parable' in Micah ii. 4. Moreover they adopt the rendering 'byword' twice, and once in the margin 'taunting speech' (Hab. ii. 6). Yet it would be an error to conclude that the English words 'parable,' 'proverb,' 'byword' are synonymous.

Now the LXX translators of all the books except Isaiah, Job, and Proverbs adhere almost invariably to the rendering *παραβολή*. Indeed, the only exceptions are two instances in which 'to become a proverb' is paraphrased (ἀφανισμός). The word *mâshâl* occurs only once in Isaiah, and is there rendered θρῆνος. On the other hand the translator of Proverbs uses *παροιμία* once certainly, perhaps twice (the reading being doubtful), and once παιδεῖα; once also *παραβολὴ*. In Job the translator read *mâshâl* five times, since in xxv. 2, where

our text vocalizes the word as a verb, he reads it as a noun. Thrice he renders *προοίμιον*. It is tempting, no doubt, to correct this into *παροιμία*, but the conjecture cannot really be considered probable. We should have to suppose that the mistake was made in all three places—that is, always in Job, and in no other book. Moreover in two of them the article would make the mistake less easy; and, in fact, *προοίμιον* is not more unsuitable, rather less so, than *παροιμία*. We may abide, therefore, by the received text. In the fourth passage the translator has *θρύλλημα* (xvii. 6). In the fifth (xiii. 12), in which Dr. Hatch thinks the Greek 'is so far from the Hebrew as to afford no evidence,' the translator took *mâshâl* in the sense of 'likeness.' Thus he never uses either *παραβολὴ* or *παροιμία*. When Dr. Hatch says that 'it will be seen in a majority of the cases in which *παραβολὴ* was not used to translate *mâshâl παροιμία* was used instead of it,' his majority consists of exactly three passages, two of which he has obtained by the conjectural alteration of *προοίμιον* to *παροιμία*. The acceptance of this alteration makes no practical difference, since the case would then be that some translators use one word and some the other, just as one English translator might use 'proverb' and another 'parable.' Dr. Hatch's evidence, however, for the equivalence of the two words is not founded on the LXX alone, but on the instances in which the Hexapla revisers substitute *παροιμία* for *παραβολή*. At first sight one would say that when a reviser alters the existing translation it is because he thinks it not accurate, and therefore such substitution is evidence that the words were not synonymous. In the present case, closer examination, we think, only confirms this view. The older translators, adhering to *παραβολὴ*, had employed it often where it was unsuitable. In the following passages, for instance, we have clear examples of 'proverbs': 1 Sam. x. 12, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' *ibid.* xxiv. 14, 'Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked'; Ezek. xviii. 2, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge.' In all these cases later translators have most properly substituted *παροιμία*. In Ps. lxxviii. 2, where the Psalmist clearly identifies his *mâshâl* with 'dark sayings of old,' Symmachus, not without reason, gave *παροιμία*, as the English translators have given 'proverb.' And in Eccles. xii. 9, where the many

<sup>1</sup> The English Version has here, 'Your remembrances are like unto ashes.' The Greek translator rendered the former word *γαυπλα*, 'Your glorying shall be like unto ashes,' *ἴστα σποδῷ*. The true rendering is probably, 'Your maxims are proverbs of ashes.'

\* pr  
ally.  
what  
that  
wor  
add  
Aq  
a di

exp  
par  
exam  
wor  
chus

tran  
first  
'cov  
the l  
'cov  
hims  
princ  
theses  
the l

T  
anal  
Dr. I  
and  
which  
mean  
judg  
trans  
the n  
stand  
in it-  
not, b  
'creat  
word,  
the E

<sup>1</sup> T  
Some r  
was the

<sup>2</sup> W  
marked  
animal

VOL

'proverbs' of the preacher are mentioned, Aquila very naturally thought *παροιμία* more suitable than *παραβολή*. On what principle we are to infer from these judicious alterations that the revisers made no sharp distinction between the two words it is impossible to discern. We should not hesitate to adduce them as proofs of the contrary. In Prov. xxv, 1 Aquila and Theodotion have *παραβολὴ* where the LXX had a different rendering.<sup>1</sup>

The nature of the 'proverbs' in these chapters sufficiently explains the alteration. They are all 'similitudes,' and *παραβολὴ* was the more suitable word. This is a striking example of clear discernment of the distinction between this word and *παροιμία*, and the same may be said of Symmachus' similar reading in xxvi. 7.

We may compare the treatment of *mâshâl* by the Greek translators to that of *διαθήκη* in the English Bible. In the first printed Bible the word was in a few instances rendered 'covenant,' but more often 'testament' (especially throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews). Subsequent revisers substituted 'covenant' for 'testament' in several instances; Dr. Hatch himself would always render the word 'covenant.' On his principles, as just exemplified in *παραβολὴ* and *παροιμία*, these facts prove that there is no sharp distinction between the English words 'covenant' and 'testament.'

The English Version would supply many other instructive analogies, one or two of which we may mention. Thus, by Dr. Hatch's method, we should conclude that 'Comforter' and 'Advocate' were synonymous, the word *παράκλητος*, which they both represent, having unquestionably the same meaning in all its occurrences. Apart from difference of judgment as to the rendering of a word, there are very few translators whose work can be safely taken as a standard of the usage of their own language. The English Version stands high in this respect, yet we find words incorrectly used in it—for example, 'soul' where 'life' is meant. We are not, however, to infer that 'soul,' 'life,' 'appetite,' 'person,' 'creature' are synonymous because they translate the same word, *nephesh*, which has indeed a dozen other renderings in the English Bible.<sup>2</sup> Yet the English Version is much more

<sup>1</sup> The reading of the LXX here is uncertain. It was probably *παιδεία*. Some manuscripts have *παροιμία*, but according to the Syro-hexaplar this was the reading of Symmachus.

<sup>2</sup> We have seen more than once special attention drawn to the marked contrast between the term 'living creature' applied to the lower animals in Gen. i. and 'living soul' applied to man—the fact being, as

homogeneous than the Septuagint, which is really a collection of versions made by a series of independent translators, differing both in their knowledge of Hebrew and in their command of Greek.

The foregoing discussion of a few of Dr. Hatch's own examples is, in our judgment, sufficient to show the unsoundness of his method of determining the meaning of New Testament Greek, and makes it unnecessary to enter on any more abstract discussion of the principles which he formulates. When we have made allowance first for legitimate diversity in the interpretation of the Hebrew, and secondly for want of skill in the translator, who may either fail to seize the precise meaning of the Hebrew or to select the appropriate Greek word, little occasion will remain for the extreme supposition of a dialectic confusion between distinct Greek words.

The number of instances in which the Septuagint alone vouches for the use of particular words, small comparatively as it is, would no doubt be considerably diminished if our knowledge of the current popular language was greater. An illustration of this may be found in the remarkable fact that Cicero frequently employs in his letters Greek words which do not occur elsewhere, yet which, from his use of them, we may infer were tolerably familiar. Even such a technical word as *ὑπομηματισμός*, in the sense of a decree of the Areopagus, appears not to be found in Greek writers. And the New Testament usage itself receives illustration from Cicero. For example, *σκύλλω*, which occurs in the Gospels in the sense 'to annoy,' is found in profane Greek writers before the second century only in its literal meaning—'to skin or rend.' But Cicero has the substantive *σκυλμὸς* in the sense of 'vexation.' Again, *συζήτησις* appears to be found only in Cicero and Philo, *ἀθέτησις* and *τροποφορέω* in Cicero only. The remarkable word *περπερεύομαι* ('Charity vaunteth not itself') is found outside the New Testament only in the later writer Antoninus. But Cicero has the compound *ἐνεπερπερεσάμην* in nearly the same sense. Telling Atticus of the speech he made in the senate after Pompey's return

our readers know, that the original is the same. But the authors who comment on the supposed contrast make the same supposition regarding the English Version that Dr. Hatch makes with regard to the Septuagint—that the translators accurately represent the original; only, knowing that the English words are not synonymous, they assume that the original words are different. If they knew the Hebrew they ought, on Dr. Hatch's principles, to infer that the translators (and the recent revisers) made no sharp distinction between 'creature' and 'soul.'

fro  
sel  
of  
the  
pea  
tre  
use  
is r  
I ex

tho  
eve  
διαρ  
both  
so a  
men  
again  
well  
from  
from  
and  
an a  
Οἰκε  
insta  
com

A  
Grin  
to G  
draw  
that  
in th  
fact,  
a rou  
exam  
be in  
(from  
the S  
the d  
and r  
emplo  
of ou

W  
words  
has m

Jan.

ction  
tors,  
theirown  
ound-  
New  
in any  
ormu-  
imate  
ondly  
seize  
appro-  
treme  
Greekalone  
tively  
if our  
. An  
act that  
which  
em, we  
chnical  
of the  
And  
from  
Gospels  
writers  
—‘to  
in the  
found  
Cicero  
unteth  
in the  
pound  
Atticus  
returnors who  
regarding  
ptuagint  
knowing  
that the  
ught, on  
the recent  
l'

from the East, ‘Heavens !’ he exclaims, ‘how I showed myself off before my new hearer Pompey ! There were shouts of applause. For my subject was the dignity of our order, the unanimity of Italy, the extinction of the conspiracy, peace and plenty. You know how I can thunder when treating such subjects.’<sup>1</sup> It is clear from this that Cicero used the word in the same sense as St. Paul, and that Grimm is mistaken in saying (after Schleusner) that he means ‘how I extolled Pompey.’

It is most interesting to note how often a word or phrase thought to be peculiarly Hellenistic is found in profane and even strictly classical writers. For example, *μερισμός* and *διαμερισμός*, both condemned by ancient grammarians, are both found in Plato; *νήθω*, also condemned, is also in Plato; so also is *ψεύσμα*, and *αἴτημα* in the sense of ‘request,’ both mentioned by Planck as only found in later writers. Aristotle again vouches for *ἀσθένημα*, *δεσμεῖν*, *ἔσθησις*, and *κνήθειν*, as well as *ἔκτρωμα*. *Χάρτης*, reckoned by some as borrowed from the Aramaic, but which was really borrowed by Aramaic from Greek, has been found in Plato Comicus (fifth century B.C.) and Cebes. *Νεόδυτος*, ‘newly planted,’ is only known from an ancient grammarian to have been used by Aristophanes. *Οἰκοδεσπότης*, said not to be used by the earlier Greeks (who instead of it used *οἶκον δεσπότης*), is nevertheless found in a comic poet of the fourth century B.C., as testified by Pollux.

An example of Professor Thayer's care in correcting Grimm's references occurs under *ἄντλημα*, which, according to Grimm, was used by Plutarch in the sense of the ‘act of drawing water’; but Professor Thayer points out, and rightly, that in the passage referred to it has the sense of ‘bucket,’ as in the New Testament. What Plutarch there mentions are, in fact, *περίακτα ἄντλήματα*, buckets worked by animals going in a round. There are other words, of which no early classical example exists, the early existence of which may nevertheless be inferred from the use of their derivatives. Such is *σαγίνη* (from which our word ‘seine’ is derived), which occurs first in the Septuagint, and afterwards in Plutarch and Lucian. But the derived verb *σαγηνεύω* is found in Herodotus and Plato, and no doubt *σαγίνη* was in familiar use amongst those who employed the thing. It might not be easy to find an example of our word ‘seine’ in our native classics.

We shall now proceed to notice some specially interesting words more in detail. First we take *μυστήριον*. This word has much misled commentators, who frequently try to bring

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Att. i. 14.*

out of it the notion of what in English is 'mysteriousness,' a notion which does not belong to the word in the New Testament at all. It is well rendered by Liddell and Scott 'a revealed secret.' It is known of course to everyone that *τὰ μυστήρια* were secrets known only to the initiated, and it may be observed that anyone might be initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries—in fact, not to be initiated was rather discreditable. It seems to have been thought by scholars until recently that the singular was found only in the Greek Testament. But, in fact, it occurs in a fragment of Menander, and simply in the sense of 'secret'—'Do not tell your *μυστήριον* to your friend.' Similarly Cicero, writing to Atticus, uses the word of a domestic matter known to himself and his correspondent, but which he did not desire to be known to others who might chance to see his letters. And for better concealment he writes about these private matters in Greek, calling them *μυστικώτερα*. The English word 'mystery' has another idea attached to it besides that of secrecy, viz. that of being beyond comprehension, or being an unsolved puzzle. This meaning has probably been fostered by confusion with a word of different etymology, namely, 'mastery,' meaning an art or profession requiring special training, the secrets of which are 'mysteries' to the uninitiated. Now this sense, as we have said, never belongs to *μυστήριον* in the New Testament. The word simply means 'a secret revealed,' and except in the Apocalypse is always used of doctrines revealed. St. Paul's words in Rom. xvi. 25, 26 are almost a definition—'The mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but is now manifested and . . . made known to all the nations.'

The passage on which interpreters chiefly rely as an instance of the word meaning something unintelligible is 1 Cor. xiv. 2—'he that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God, for no man understandeth; howbeit [R.V. but] in the spirit he speaketh mysteries.' The last words are usually explained as equivalent to the preceding 'no man understandeth.' Interpreters have, as it seems, been carried away by the associations of the English word as if that were the most natural meaning to give the Greek. But in truth we get a much better sense by adhering to the usual signification. The sense is: 'No doubt he is unfolding spiritual truths.' The qualification is of exactly the same kind as that which St. Paul introduces a few verses later (ver. 17), when he says of the man who gives thanks in an unknown tongue, 'thou verily givest thanks well.' Instead of stating this as a possibility, he more effectively asserts it categorically. The

usual interpretation substitutes for this delicate and characteristic qualification of his censure a flat tautology, and to gain this introduces an otherwise unexampled meaning of the word.

In the preceding chapter, xiii. 2, 'though I understand all mysteries and all knowledge,' the sense is obviously the same; also in St. Matt. xiii. 11, 'To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven'—that is, the teachings or revelations of the Gospel. There is no ground for introducing the notion of 'purposes' as Grimm does 'the secret purposes relating to the kingdom of God,' nor with Robinson to understand 'the mysterious things of the kingdom,' neither of which meanings is so suitable as the simple one just mentioned. Nor, again, is there any ground for importing the idea of incomprehensibility as many do into 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, 'the mystery of the faith,' 'the mystery of godliness,' both being equivalent to 'the revealed teaching of the Gospel.' There was one particular doctrine which, as commentators have noticed, St. Paul spoke of as the mystery of the Gospel for which he was in bonds—namely, the doctrine of the admission of the Gentiles. But there was nothing specially 'mysterious' or incomprehensible in this.

What about 1 Cor. ii. 7, where the Apostle says that he speaks 'the wisdom of God in a mystery'? Does this mean 'in an incomprehensible manner (or matter)'? If the words 'in a mystery' were to be joined with the word 'hidden,' this might be so, but the best commentators rightly join them with the preceding words. Now observe that in the following verses St. Paul describes this wisdom as hitherto concealed, but revealed to us. Was he likely to say, 'The wisdom (or philosophy) which God has revealed to me I preach in an incomprehensible "mystery"?' Nay; but 'a Divine philosophy consisting in matters taught by revelation.' We note, merely in passing, that 'philosophy' is the word which seems best to express St. Paul's meaning in these verses. 'My speech was not with persuasive words of philosophy . . . howbeit we speak philosophy among those that are mature, not indeed a philosophy of this world, . . . but a Divine philosophy of revelation.'

In the Apocalypse we seem to have a modification of this meaning. Thus, in i. 20 'the mystery of the seven stars,' *i.e.* as we might say, 'the secret of the seven stars'—that is, the hidden thing signified. This agrees with the use of the word in the Septuagint, in Daniel ii. 18, 27–30, where the English Version has 'secret,' which use is indeed, as we have seen,

quite classical. But there is no reason for supposing that *μυστήριον* signifies 'a hidden meaning' any more than that the English 'secret' does so. The secret of a puzzle is the solution of it, but 'secret' is not therefore='solution.' And in the passage in question the English word 'secret' might be perfectly well substituted: 'the secret of the woman'; 'the secret of the stars.' These being obviously symbolical of something, the secret belonging to them is the thing signified by them; but it is not the word *μυστήριον* that carries with it the notion of 'symbol.' So when St. Paul says that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to him, i.e. the preaching of the Gospel to the uncircumcised, it would be obviously wrong to infer that *εὐαγγέλιον* meant 'preaching the gospel.'

In both places it may be further noted that it is not the symbol that is called *μυστήριον*, but the thing symbolised. Hence these passages do not justify us in interpreting Eph. v. 32 as 'this symbol [*sc.* of the joining of husband and wife into one flesh] is a great one' (Dr. Hatch). If the expression had been 'the *μυστήριον* of this,' there might have been more plausibility in the suggestion.

The passage just referred to is somewhat difficult—'This is a great "mystery," but I speak concerning Christ and His Church.' The English reader can hardly avoid taking this to mean 'This is a very mysterious thing.' The Revised Version has 'this mystery is great,' which, though more correct, yet suggests the same misconception. Even if *μυστήριον* meant 'a mysterious thing,' still *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν* could hardly bear the meaning suggested by the English words. Grimm regards the passage as an example of the meaning 'the hidden sense,' viz. of the saying quoted in verse 31, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother,' &c. We cannot see how *τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο* could mean this. And surely it is not the hidden sense of this text that is called 'great,' but the doctrine about Christ and His Church. Indeed, the Apostle goes on to make this clear to his readers by adding *ἔγώ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, that is, 'This teaching is deep; I, however, mean it with reference to Christ and His Church.' Then he passes back to the subject of marriage with *πλήν*.

Grimm's explanation of the origin of the phrase *σκιά θανάτου*, 'shadow of death,' is not that adopted by recent Hebrew scholars. The expression thus rendered by the Septuagint, and so intended to be read by the scholars who pointed the Hebrew text, is really a single word having no

con  
Ind  
eve  
the  
easi  
the  
read  
valle  
of-d  
out  
ligh  
nes  
hide  
turn  
day

dark  
this  
Script  
Doubt  
cour

I  
rema  
ment  
speci  
mean  
follow  
order  
Grim  
word  
the C  
then,  
to us  
Jew t  
which  
praye  
willow  
of ex  
unkn  
hymn  
'Hall  
itself.

O  
for in

that  
that  
s the  
And  
ight  
an';  
al of  
nified  
with  
t the  
e. the  
d be  
ching

t the  
lised.  
Eph.  
wife  
ssion  
more

This  
d His  
g this  
Ver-  
correct,  
*γριον*  
*μέγα*  
Eng-  
of the  
verse  
other,'  
in this.  
hat is  
church.  
readers  
, that  
ference  
e sub-

e *σκία*  
recent  
by the  
rs who  
ng no

connexion with 'death,' but meaning 'dense darkness.' Indeed, this is necessarily the meaning of the phrase, whatever its origin. Doubtless the association of 'death' with the idea 'valley of the shadow' is too firmly fixed to be easily dissolved; yet a comparison of the passages in which the phrase occurs ought to have taught even the English reader that the words in Ps. xxiii. should not be joined 'the valley-of-the-shadow of death,' but 'the valley of the shadow-of-death.' Thus, in Job xxviii. 3, the miner is said to search out the shadow of death. In xiii. 22 God is said to bring to light the shadow of death. In xxxiv. 22, 'There is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves.' Again, in Amos v. 8, 'Seek him that . . . turneth the shadow of death into the morning and maketh the day dark with night.'

Accordingly in the 23rd Psalm what is spoken of is the darkness of deep trouble. Has not the misunderstanding of this verse done much to foster the notion that the normal Scriptural view of death is that of a dark and gloomy passage? Doubtless to many it is so, but this is not a view to be encouraged. The survivors, indeed, have often most truly to pass through the valley of the shadow.

Had space permitted we should have liked to make some remarks on the Aramaic and Latin words in the New Testament. We shall notice only the word Hosanna, which has a special interest. Everyone knows that it is a Hebrew word meaning 'save now.' But in St. Matth. xxi. 9, 15, it occurs followed by a dative, 'Hosanna to the son of David.' In order to connect this grammatically with the word Hosanna, Grimm renders the latter 'Be propitious.' But the Hebrew word does not bear this interpretation any more than would the Greek *σωσον* by which the Septuagint render it. How, then, is the dative to be explained? The answer that occurs to us is, that the word was one which was familiar to every Jew from the frequency of its use at the feast of tabernacles, which feast was even called by this name, as were also the prayers used during it, and even the boughs of myrtle and willow, but that it came to be used simply as an expression of exultation, the meaning of which was forgotten, perhaps unknown, to the crowd. So the word Hallelujah is used in a hymn of the late Bishop Wordsworth, followed by the dative, 'Hallelujah to the Saviour,' although it includes its object in itself.

On proper names Grimm's Lexicon is full. Under 'Ηρώδης, for instance, we have two columns giving a very complete

account of the family. Under *Kuprīvios* Professor Thayer supplies the references which will enable the reader to understand the present state of knowledge.

Both Grimm and his editor accept without hesitation the identification of Alphæus with Clopas. It is, indeed, constantly asserted as if it were open to no objection on the part of Hebrew scholars. We cannot here discuss the philological question, but may mention that the highest living authority on Hebrew philology, Franz Delitzsch, declares it impossible that the latter name can be a phonetic variation of the former.<sup>1</sup>

The names of Palestinian Jews in the New Testament have no small significance in connexion with the question whether the people were 'bilinguals' or not. The occurrence of purely Hebrew names of course proves nothing, as such names have always been in use amongst Jews, whatever their language. But how is it possible for Greek names to come into use amongst persons of Jewish race speaking exclusively the Hebrew tongue, and singularly unwilling to abandon traditional family names? Of such names there are two in the very small number of the Apostles—namely, Andrew and Philip. Outside this number we have another Philip, Cleopas, Stephen, Nicodemus, Alexander, and others. It is not credible that the families in which such names were used were either ignorant of Greek or unfriendly to Greek learning. There are other names which, although of Hebrew origin, owe their form to use in the mouths of speakers of Greek; such are Joses, Magdalene, and others. Amongst these we may include Simon, which was a genuine Greek name, but from its resemblance to the Hebrew Simeon was adopted by persons who bore the latter name. The case of the name Mary is peculiar and noteworthy. The Virgin is always Mariam (except twice in a few of the best manuscripts); the sister of Lazarus is also ('probably always,' Westcott and Hort) Mariam; but Mary of Clopas is always Maria. The latter was, of course, a Roman name, easily adopted as an equivalent for the Hebrew; but how are we to account for the variety, except on the supposition that the two forms were used contemporaneously, one by the more Hebrew-speaking families and the other by the more Greek-speaking families?

Some of the older lexicographers multiply the significations of words by not keeping in view the distinction between the meaning of a word and its application. In the case of substantives this is the logical distinction between connotation

<sup>1</sup> *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie und Kirche*, 1876, p. 603.

and denotation. In all languages it is common to use a more general word instead of one more definite, where there is no danger of mistake. Thus we may speak of a 'weapon' when we mean a 'sword,' 'men' when we mean 'soldiers.' With a few verbs of very general meaning there is a similar usage. The English verb 'do' is an example. Colloquially it is used to suggest almost any kind of action, the particular kind being indicated by the object of the verb, or having been definitely expressed just before. Thus we speak of 'doing' 'some sketches,' 'a message' (Shakespeare), 'doing the grand tour,' 'doing a Greek exercise,' 'doing a bill,' 'doing a chop,' &c. Or, again, to avoid repetition, we may say, 'When you have watered these plants do those outside,' 'Sweep this room and arrange the flowers and books tidily, and then do the next.' Sometimes it is the occupation of the person speaking or spoken to that supplies the necessary limitation. For instance, addressing even an amateur photographer, we might suggest his 'doing' a particular building or the like. But these are not different meanings of the verb 'do' any more than 'quadruped' has different meanings when used of horses, of cows, of rabbits, &c., else we might take Mark Twain's suggestion seriously and abolish half the verbs in the language.

The true test of a technical sense is the occurrence of the word in a phrase which would not be correctly understood without the knowledge of this special meaning; for example, the word 'road' = 'rajd' in 'Whither did ye make a road to-day?' 'to lead' in printing, 'caput,' used of citizenship; 'discedere,' of dividing in the senate.

Dr. Field's book is really a delightful one. It consists of only 155 pages, but every page is full of matter and throws new light on some passage. The reader will, we are sure, thank us for giving a few examples of Dr. Field's results. We cannot, indeed, do much more than give results, as to give his proofs would involve encumbering our pages with Greek quotations. We confine ourselves to lexical matter. 'Αγονία is an important word.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Field shows that its radical idea is 'fear more or less intense.' Diogenes Laertius defines it as fear of something uncertain. So also the *Etymologicum Magnum* says the word is used of one who is about to enter into a contest or ἀγών, and hence, of fear simply. Accordingly we find both the substantive and its verb ἀγωνιᾶ constantly joined with words expressive of fear. Instances are quoted

<sup>1</sup> St. Luke, xxii. 44.

from Demosthenes, Josephus, Plutarch, Chrysostom, and others, to which we might add 2 Macc. iii. 14, 16, 20. Servius on Virgil, *Aen.* xii. 737, tells us that it corresponds to the Latin 'trepidatio,' 'Dum trepidat, i. e. dum turbatur, festinat, quod Græcis ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἔστιν.' And in the Greek versions of the Old Testament, the verb ἀγωνίάω is used in this sense.

Of course the verb ἀγωνίζω is not derived from ἀγωνία and does not mean 'agonize.'

Another interesting note is on St. Mark xiv. 72, ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε, for which Dr. Field adopts the rendering vindicated by Salmasius and Fritzsche, 'he covered his head, and wept.' The other three renderings, two of which are given in the margin of the A. V., viz. 'When he thought thereon he wept,' 'he wept abundantly,' and 'he began to weep,' are, he remarks, frigid and lifeless (especially the first); they enfeeble the description instead of enlivening it. 'The chord was struck, the sluices were opened, when Peter called to mind the word that Jesus had said to him.' Then, say St. Matthew and St. Luke, 'Peter went out, and wept bitterly.' Instead of the epithet, St. Mark introduces an additional action, ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε, 'he did something and wept.' He might have done many things to show the intensity of his grief. He might have thrown himself on the ground as some persons in Xenophon; he might have turned himself about like Joseph, Gen. xlvi. 24; he might have covered his face like David, 2 Sam. xix. 4. Any of these actions would have expressed in a lively manner the ἔκλαυσε πικρῶς of the other Evangelists; and the last may be shown to be supported on linguistic grounds. Dr. Field proceeds to quote illustrations of the custom of covering the head in weeping, showing also that this covering is expressed in various ways, one of which is ἐγκαλυψάμενος. Συγκαλυψάμενος is also used. The question is, would ἐπιβαλὼν be likely to convey the same idea to a Greek reader as either of these words, and this is answered by the fact that it did so to Theophylact, who explains it by ἐπικαλυψάμενος τὴν κεφαλήν. It is no objection to this that ἴμάτιον or the like must be mentally supplied, for there is the same ellipsis in the case of the other two words quoted, and even with the expression περιρρυζάμενος ἔκλαιε, which occurs in Chariton, Aphrodisiensis.<sup>1</sup> And we know that ἐπιβαλεῖν may be used of putting on apparel. This explanation is not to be summarily rejected as 'fanciful'; the word may have been a colloquial one, 'such as would have stirred the bile of a Phrynicus or a Thomas Magister, who would have inserted it in their Index'

<sup>1</sup> Περὶ Χαρέαν κ.τ.λ. i. 3.

*Expurgatorius* with a caution, 'Ἐπιβαλὼν μὴ λέγε, ἀλλὰ ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἢ ἐπικαλυψάμενος.'

It seems to us that Dr. Field has again hit the mark in 1 Cor. iv. 6, in his interpretation of *μετασχηματίζω*. The verb means 'to change the outward appearance of anything, the thing itself remaining the same.' Thus it is used by Symmachus of Saul disguising himself, and similarly by Theodotion of Jeroboam's wife. So in the present case the Apostle 'had been speaking the truth, but, as he now declares, *truth in disguise*.' That is, that, instead of naming the leaders or favourite teachers to whom the several parties attached themselves, or even describing them anonymously, St. Paul gives the names of himself, Apollos, Cephas, and even Christ. Those to whom he wrote knew that he was speaking 'by a fiction' from the first; but for the sake of others he here, having accomplished his purpose, throws off the disguise, and declares plainly his object in assuming it. 'These things, brethren, I have by a fiction transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes, that ye might learn in us,' &c. This was the view taken by Chrysostom<sup>1</sup> :—

'As when a sick child kicks and turns away from the food offered by the physicians, the attendants call the father or the tutor and bid them take the food from the physicians' hands and bring it, so that out of fear towards them he may take it and be quiet; so also Paul, intending to find fault with the Corinthians on behalf of certain other persons (of some as being injured, of others as being honoured above measure), did not set down the persons themselves, but conducted the argument in his own name and that of Apollos in order that reverencing these they might receive his mode of cure. But that once received, he presently makes known in whose behalf he was so expressing himself. Now this was not hypocrisy, but condescension and management.'

On Phil. ii. 16, *λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχουντες* ('holding forth the word of life,' A. V. and R. V.), Dr. Field maintains a view which we have not seen elsewhere, interpreting the passage: 'Among whom ye appear as lights in the world, being (to it) in the stead of life.' The sense of *ἐπέχειν* required by the common version is not supported by any sound example, and, moreover, the absence of the article is to be noted. The actual phrase *λόγον ἐπέχειν* occurs not infrequently in later authors, and always in the sense 'corresponding to' or 'being analogous to.' We may quote St. Basil, *Hexaem.* ix.: *κακὸν δὲ πᾶν ἀρρωστίᾳ ψυχῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀρετὴ λόγον ὑγειας ἐπέχει.* This use has been illustrated by Wetstein, and the interpretation,

<sup>1</sup> In *Epist. ad Cor. I. Hom. xi.*

which is that of the older Syriac translator, has been adopted by some other moderns.

On *καταβραβεύειν*, Col. ii. 18 (*μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω*, 'Let no man rob you of your reward,' R. V.), Dr. Field argues with much reason that the word means 'condemn' without any reference to a prize. The single word *βραβεύειν*, in all the examples we have of it, is used, in the sense of arbitrating or deciding, without the notion of a prize. This view agrees with the definition of *καταβραβεύειν* given by Phavorinus and with the Syriac versions. The word is found in Eustathius on *Iliad* A. 402 with reference to Briareus, who, in opposition to his father Poseidon, assisted Zeus. The remark of Eustathius is that as amongst men sons are often unlike their father or disagree with him, so the mythical Briareus, here preferring justice to natural affection, opposes his father, and so *καταβραβεύει αὐτόν*, 'as the ancients say.' The only example extant in an earlier writer is in Demosthenes (*Adv. Midiam*), where the sense is apparently 'to procure a condemnation unfairly.' If any by-sense was in the Apostle's mind in choosing this word in preference to *κατακρίνειν*, it may possibly have been that of *assumption* and *officialism*, as it follows *εἰκῆ φυσιούμενος*.

Another note, quoted by Dr. Field from Wetstein, is worth mentioning. It refers to St. John xxi. 5, which reads in the A. V. 'Children, have ye any meat?' and in R. V. 'Have ye aught to eat?' Dr. Field renders 'Have ye taken any fish?' The scholiast on Aristoph. *Nubes*, 731, tells us expressly that the word was commonly used by fishers and fowlers, who say *ἔχεις τι;*

Perhaps we may be permitted to add one more note from Dr. Field, on *παρακύψας* St. Luke xxiv. 12, St. John xx. 5, 11, 'Stooping and looking in,' R. V. The idea of stooping down is not in the word, which is used, for example, Gen. xxvi. 8, 'looking through the window' (so Prov. vii. 6). In Eccles. xxi. 23 it is rendered in E. V. 'peep in'—'A fool will peep in at the door into the house.' Casaubon long ago rejected 'stooping,' remarking that what the word means is stretching out the neck with a slight bending of the body, 'protractionem colli cum modica corporis incurvatione.' This disposes of the argument founded on the use of this word as to the position of the tomb. Compare Jas. i. 25; 1 Pet. i. 12.

Dr. Field undertakes the defence of the old rendering of *δεισιδαιμονεστέρους* in Acts xvii. 22 with a slight modification as in the Revised Version, 'somewhat superstitious,' in opposition to a 'distinguished prelate' who rendered it 'unusually

God-fearing,' saying that the Apostle 'thus struck the one chord to which their hearts would vibrate.' That the latter rendering gives an erroneous idea must be admitted, as 'God-fearing' is an expression which not only implies commendation but also reference to the One Supreme God, yet it is nearer the truth than 'superstitious.' That the word was used in a good sense by classical writers (including Xenophon and Aristotle) is admitted. But Dr. Field shows by quotations from Plutarch (to which we might add others from Polybius) that the general use of the word was *in malam partem* as expressing 'the religious feeling carried to excess'; and Theophrastus's well-known description of the δεισιδαιμονία agrees with this. Dr. Hatch takes the same view, quoting also Philo, who frequently distinguishes δεισιδαιμονία from εὐσέβεια, 'piety.' It seems to us that it may be fairly said that what is proved by these passages is, not that the word itself implied blame, but that the thing was blamed by the writers; in other words, that persons of whom it might justly be used would not regard it as offensive. An admirable illustration of this is supplied by Polybius (xii. 24, 5) in his comparison of the Roman state with others. It is, he says, in their views about the gods that the Romans are especially distinguished for the better, and the thing to which the Roman state owes its stability is just this, which amongst other men is censured, namely δεισιδαιμονία, which has been carried to such an extreme both in private and public matters as cannot be surpassed. He adds, in the spirit of a scoffing unbeliever, that the notions about gods and things of the other world were spread by the ancients as a matter of policy, as it is only by fear of the unknown and suchlike dramatic fictions that the multitude can be controlled. Now for the consequence. Amongst the Greeks, says he, men who handle public money even to the value of a talent, though they have ten check-clerks and as many seals, and twice as many witnesses, cannot keep faith; but amongst the Romans, men who in magistracies and embassies handle very large sums, are honest from simple regard to their oath. In other nations it is a rare thing to find a man keeping his hand off public property, whereas amongst the Romans it is a rare thing for a man to be found doing anything of the kind. Would a Roman regard it as censure if in such circumstances he was called δεισιδαιμονέστερος?

In St. Paul's speech the internal evidence appears to us decisive that no blame was intended. In the first place, this view makes the Apostle commence his address with an offensive expression, a thing quite opposed to his practice. In the

next place, what is the ground of this implied censure? The inscription 'To a God unknown.' Even a less sympathetic missionary than St. Paul, seeing altars to Aphrodite, Zeus, Dionysus, and the rest, would doubtless find in the inscription to an unknown God just the one title that was least open to objection. Is it conceivable that St. Paul should produce just this as a mark of 'religious feeling carried to excess' or of 'superstition'? Does he proceed to say anything which can be construed into a reason for condemning this instance of superstition? On the contrary, he lays hold of it as just the one sign-post pointing in the right direction, just the one thing in their religion which he could make use of as a help to induce them to listen to the truth. What would be the meaning of saying 'Ye carry your religious feeling to excess when in addition to Zeus &c. ye venerate a God whom ye confess ye do not know. This is mere superstition; therefore I will tell you that this unknown God is the only one to be worshipped at all'?

If no other instance occurred of the word being used without implying censure, this passage would of itself furnish one. But we not only have such instances in Xenophon and Aristotle, but (if these be objected to as too classical) in a later writer, Diodorus Siculus. Speaking of the instructions given to each Egyptian king by the priest, he says, 'This he did, urging the king to *δεισιδαιμονία* and a God-pleasing life' (i. 70). Again, speaking of the asylum afforded by a temple in Palica to slaves who fled from cruel masters, and who remained there until they received satisfactory pledges, he adds: 'No one is related to have ever broken the faith thus pledged to his slaves; for when they have sworn, their *δεισιδαιμονία* towards the gods makes them keep faith with their slaves' (xi. 89). Dr. Hatch himself quotes a *senatus consultum* of B.C. 38, preserved in an inscription, in which the word signifies simply 'religious observances.'

It is curious to observe in the case of the word *διαθήκη*, not only the divergence of Dr. Field and Dr. Hatch, but the absolute confidence of each that his own view is the only possible one. The former, on Heb. ix. 16, 17, remarks: 'If the question were put to any person of common intelligence, "What document is that which is of no force at all in the lifetime of the person who executed it?" the answer can only be "A man's *will* or *testament*." A covenant is out of the question.' On the other hand, Dr. Hatch with equal confidence affirms: 'There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of "covenant" in the New Testament, and

especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX as the Epistle to the Hebrews.' There are no doubt great difficulties on both sides: on the latter, the fact that the statements in Heb. ix. 16, 17 are not true of a covenant, but are true of a testament; on the former, that in the Mosaic διαθήκη there was no death of the 'testator.' May not the solution be that the writer did not distinguish the two senses in his own mind? This seems to be the view taken by Grimm.

We venture to suggest that a similar solution is applicable in some other instances where interpreters find it hard to decide which of two senses to assign to an ambiguous expression in the original. One important example occurs to us: δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, in Rom. i. 17, which may either be righteousness as an attribute of God (as seems to be required by the antithesis of ὄργὴ θεοῦ in the next verse) or righteousness 'flowing from God and acceptable to Him,' as subsequent developments suggest. In fact, the expression preserved its vagueness to the writer himself until, in the course of his argument, he found it needful to separate the two ideas, which he does in iii. 26, 'that He might Himself be just and the Justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.' A consideration of the whole passage must convince us that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ cannot have an entirely different sense in i. 17 and in iii. 26, since iii. 21 resumes the subject of i. 17, which had been interrupted by a digression.

We have referred to the Tables appended to Professor Thayer's lexicon. In addition to those already mentioned, there are lists of words peculiar to the respective New Testament writers. As showing the completeness of these lists, it may be stated that while Dr. Schaff, in his valuable *Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version*, reckons 71 words peculiar to St. Matthew and 45 to St. Mark, Professor Thayer's number for the former is 137 and for the latter 102; or, leaving out words of which the reading is doubtful, 116 and 70 respectively. St. Luke's Gospel furnishes no less than 312, besides 61 which are found also in the Acts, but there only. This leads us to observe that in discussing New Testament usage we must not lose sight of the fact that we are dealing with writings of at least ten different authors of different degrees of education and knowledge of Greek. It may well be that one of these writers may, for example, carefully distinguish synonyms which another confounds, or may in other respects be more exact in his use of words. Of course the best commentators do take note of this, but there is a great tendency to forget it.

One thing will, we think, be clear from what we have said in these pages: namely, that while there has been really splendid work done in the department of New Testament lexicography, the field has by no means been exhausted, and there still remains much scope for the energy of fresh labourers.

## ART. II.—FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SCOTTISH LITURGY.

*The Supplement to the 'Scottish Guardian' for August 23, 1889, containing a Pastoral Letter addressed by the Bishops to the Presbyters of the Scottish Church, and the Scottish Liturgy as authorized for Use. Second draft, 1889. (Edinburgh, 1889.)*

WE resume the consideration of the revision of the Scottish 'Liturgy' or Communion Office, which was described in our October number. The 'statement of facts,' to which in that article we 'scrupulously confined ourselves,' will be naturally followed up by some attempt to appreciate the changes proposed, on the merits of which the Scottish Bishops, in their pastoral of August 2, 1889, invite suggestions from liturgical students who are interested in the wellbeing of the Northern Church. It would ill become the *Church Quarterly Review* to seem indifferent to such an invitation. Without further preface, we will go through the alterations in the order in which the 'revised draft' exhibits them.

And first, as to the designation of the celebrant. Why should not the Scottish Church take this good opportunity of conforming the language of her Liturgy, in this respect, to that of the English and American Offices? The substitution of 'presbyter' for 'priest' in the Scottish Prayer-book of 1637 was one of those concessions to un-Churchly prejudice which seldom in fact succeed, and which never deserve to succeed. But at any rate, it was consistently applied throughout the book. Now, however, the congregations which use the Scottish Liturgy use for other services the Book of Common Prayer,<sup>1</sup> in which 'presbyter' never once occurs, and the regular designation of the minister of the second order is 'priest.' And what is more, we find 'priests'

<sup>1</sup> The slight exception which occurs when the traditional Scottish form of Confirmation is adopted is not relevant to the question.

in one passage of the Scottish Liturgy proper, where 'bishops, priests, and deacons' represents the English 'bishops and curates' in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church. Why should not this familiar term be consistently adopted throughout? No principle, surely, can be urged against such conformity to received Anglican language. And persons who are suspicious of 'sacerdotalism' (without being in all cases capable of defining the object of their dread) will certainly not be reassured on that head, with regard to the Scottish Liturgy as it stands, and as it is proposed that it shall stand, by the continued use of 'presbyter' in its rubrics. The essential difference between the idea of a 'presbyter' as represented in that Liturgy, and the idea of a 'presbyter' in the Presbyterian sense, is too manifest to need a word of demonstration. There is nothing therefore to be said, from any point of view, for 'presbyter' as descriptive of a Scottish celebrant. Nor do we see what is the value of 'or curate' in the first three rubrics. 'Curate' is now popularly used for the assistant curate, as distinct from the 'parochus'; but in these passages it must mean the 'parochus' or incumbent himself. When revision is in hand, the term should be either laid aside, or so used as to be ordinarily intelligible.

The rubrics about the position of the holy table, and the position of the celebrant at the beginning of the Liturgy, are happily made still more general than in the old Scottish Prayer-book. Its direction that the table should 'stand at the uppermost part of the chancel or church,' which Cosin wished to adopt in a modified form for the English Liturgy, is retained. But the reading 'north side or end' is struck out. The celebrant's position is to be 'at the altar.' This is a clear gain, for the wording of 1637 seemed to ignore the common-sense distinction between 'side' and 'end'; and the phrase 'north side' by itself has been, as we know too well, a fruitful cause of debate, owing to the difference between the 'lengthwise' position of the holy table as contemplated in 1552 and the 'altarwise' position as now—thanks to Laud—universally established. But why is the word 'carpet' retained in the obsolete sense of a cloth to cover the table? And might not the words, 'having at the Communion time a carpet and a fair white linen cloth upon it,' suggest that at other times it is to be devoid of any cloth or frontal, which certainly cannot be intended? The words 'with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated,' are similarly a survival from 1637; but what do they mean? Perhaps the framers of Charles I.'s book intended to suggest candlesticks;

but if a modern Scottish incumbent wishes to obey this rubric, how is he to ascertain its intention?

In spite of the precedent set by the English and the old Scottish books, it would be well to detach the preliminary directions from the one immediately following, and to make it an independent rubric referring to the commencement of the Liturgy. The celebrant is to stand 'at the altar' (this term is used here and in a subsequent rubric), 'and say the Lord's Prayer, with this collect following for due preparation.' A comma is needed after 'following' for the Lord's Prayer itself is properly part of this preparation, even as in the old English rites it was said by the priest below the steps of the altar. We should like to see it prefaced by 'The Lord be with you,' or 'Let us pray,' in order to get rid of a seeming abruptness.

The qualifying words of 1637, 'either according to the letter or to the mystical importance of the said commandment,' are conveniently modernized into 'either according to the letter or to the spiritual import of each commandment,'—the reference, of course, being to the Sabbath-law, inasmuch as we do not profess to keep the Fourth Commandment in the letter, which refers not generally to one day in seven, but to the seventh or last day in the week. The Evangelical summary of the law appears to have been introduced into the Scottish rite under the influence of Bishop Gadderar; about the same time it was adopted into the English Nonjurors' Liturgy, not as 'an alternative with, but a substitute for the Decalogue,' as Bishop Dowden observes in his invaluable *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*. On the other hand, the American Liturgy has it as an addition to the Decalogue.<sup>1</sup> At present the Scottish form is a combination of Mark xii. 29-31 with Matt. xxii. 38, 40: the bishops propose to follow the Nonjurors' and the American use by adopting the shorter text of St. Matthew simply.

The collect for the Queen (which most of us will feel to be hardly in place here) is superseded<sup>2</sup> by the collect, 'O Almighty Lord and everlasting God,' which heretofore has been used in Scotland as an alternative. It was deemed appropriate in this place, as a sort of expansion of the concluding parts of the ten Kyries; but it is hardly neces-

<sup>1</sup> The American Church Convention has recently permitted the 'Summary' to be in certain cases substituted for the Decalogue.

<sup>2</sup> This omission will hardly be deemed a token of 'disloyalty' on the part of a Church which long disowned the reigning dynasty on the ground of fidelity to the House of Stuart. It will probably be admitted that the amount of *regalism* in our Prayer Book would be excessive, even if we were still living under the 'personal monarchy' which it presupposes.

sary  
tau  
coll  
of  
Scc  
be  
Gos  
the  
wisi  
of  
left  
ness  
unin  
of a  
glad  
life

out  
desi  
a ce  
not  
' De  
by r  
disc  
begin  
tenc  
rubr  
' Ble  
conn  
offer  
table  
the c  
of T  
of T  
in so  
tioni  
about  
throu  
tent  
And  
grou  
our  
water

1  
ordin

sary to that effect, or rather it is, in that point of view, tautological; and it might be better to pass at once to the collect for the day. The Doxology after the announcement of the Gospel is restored in its old reading, for which the Scottish canons, evidently *per incuriam*, substituted 'Glory be to Thee, O God.' The announcement of the 'end' of the Gospel, which, Bishop Dowden thinks, may have come into the Book of 1637 on the suggestion of Wren, and which Cosin wished to introduce into the English rite with the alteration of 'so' into 'here,' as in Scotland it is altered into 'thus,' is left out, and its omission is a gain in point of impressiveness, as any one may see by observing the grandeur of an uninterrupted transition from the closing words of the Gospel of a great holyday to 'I believe in one God.' We are very glad to see a comma carefully inserted before 'and Giver of life' in the Nicene Creed.

'If there be a sermon, it followeth' just after the giving out of notices and the bidding of prayers on behalf of any who desire such intercession. This provides for the possibility of a celebration without a sermon, which, strictly speaking, is not contemplated by the English rubric. In the exhortation, 'Dearly beloved in the Lord,' a most happy change is made by reading, 'We eat and drink judgment to ourselves, not discerning the Lord's Body.' The lax phrase of 1661, 'shall begin the offertory,' is retained, although properly a single sentence suffices to constitute the offertory, as we gather from the rubric of 1549. At the first oblation the words of David, 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever,' are strictly connected with, instead of being as heretofore prior to, the offering up and placing the bread and wine upon the Lord's table (might not 'altar' be appropriate here?); and instead of the clause, 1 Chron. xxix. 12, 'Both riches and honour come of Thee,' it is proposed to read from verse 14, 'All things come of Thee.' But we must not refrain from expressing a hope that in some way or other provision will be made for an express sanctioning of the Mixture. It is perfectly needless to say anything about the 'venerable antiquity' of this practice, its prevalence throughout Greek and Latin Christendom, or its practical retention by representative Anglican prelates, notably Bishop Andrewes and Bishop Wilson. We should take yet higher ground, and dwell on the moral certainty that the cup which our Lord Himself consecrated contained wine mingled with water. Dr. Edersheim says positively<sup>1</sup> that the Paschal wine

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii. 485. He says the like about the wine ordinarily used by the Jews of that age (ii. 208).

was mixed with water, though the proportion of water was much larger than in the Eucharistic use of the Christian Church. Our Lord's own phrase, 'the fruit of the vine,' was the Jewish description of wine thus mixed, unmixed wine being called 'fruit of the tree.' In view of such a consideration we should gravely question the competency of any Church, or any ecclesiastical authority within any Church, to *forbid* the Mixture, after the unhappy precedent of the Armenian Church. And we would respectfully submit to the Scottish bishops, who preside over a Church in which the Mixture was long prevalent, and who lately took part in a Pan-Anglican conference which significantly affirmed that 'true wine, *diluted* or undiluted,' was the only proper 'element in the administration of the cup,' that they would best consult the interest of Catholic life and practice throughout the Anglican communion, as well as within their own special area, by inserting into their revised liturgy a distinct reference to a usage which no one can deny to be primæval, and which, as it happens, was for some time kept up among Presbyterians themselves, as we learn from Dr. Sprott's *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*. We have lately heard an Anglican bishop say, 'The Scottish bishops *ought* to provide for it; they are unfettered, and their doing so would have a great effect.'

Of the new proper Prefaces we are bound to say that we think them capable of improvement. In the Advent Preface, 'whom Thou didst promise as the Saviour of mankind' would surely be better for the change of 'promise' into 'send,' so that the first Advent might be explicitly commemorated. The Epiphany Preface is substantially ancient, and in its own way beautiful; but one would wish, on that day, to be as 'Pauline' as possible, and a still more apposite and instructive form might be obtained by borrowing from Eph. ii. a context just preceding the Epiphany Epistle. There is a cumbrousness in the Purification Preface:<sup>1</sup> 'Our Lord, made of a woman' ['made' is well corrected in the Revised Version into 'born'], 'made under the law, and as on this day presented in the Temple' [an iteration of part of the day's collect] 'was revealed to Thy servants as a light,' &c. The same remark applies more strongly to the opening of the Annunciation Preface: 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord, the wonderful mystery of whose incarnation in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary Thou didst as on this day announce by the

<sup>1</sup> In the Parisian scale of festivals, the Purification and Annunciation rank higher (*annualia minora*) than feasts of Apostles, whereas in the Roman they are classed with the latter as 'secondary doubles.'

message of an angel.' Surely this might be made both simpler in grammatical structure and more harmonious in rhythmical flow. Rhythm, again, would be better secured by altering, in the Saints' days' Preface, 'Thy Church instructed in the way that leadeth to everlasting life' into 'Thy Church be led in the way of everlasting life,' and, at the beginning of the same Preface, 'who *did* vouchsafe' reads somewhat awkwardly. So too, in the Preface for All Saints, the attempt to be literal in the rendering of a famous Augustinian formula, so far as its construction is concerned, involves some neglect of those requirements of English idiom which have been for the most part so fully satisfied in the Prayer-Book wording of ancient collects: 'In whom [*i.e.* in Thy Saints], crowning their graces, Thou crownest Thine own gifts.' The participle, standing nakedly by itself, is Latin, but not English: we want some expansion of a wording too condensed for the native ear. And what becomes of the antithesis, when 'graces' are set over against 'gifts'? Either it simply vanishes, and the lesson intended is lost, or else 'graces' is misunderstood as *not* suggesting a gift from above. Moreover, *coronare* is more intelligibly represented in English by 'to reward.' On the whole, this preface, like the other new prefices, would gain by a further revision; let anyone try the effect of monotoning it, and he will feel, we should expect, that it wants both smoothing and lightening. Some may think that a proper preface might be as apposite at Michaelmas as at 'Hallowmas,' and something might also be said for the use of such a preface throughout Passiontide. At any rate, it ought not to be difficult to produce a better form than that which stands in the Missal for that period, beginning, 'Qui salutem humani generis.'

It is a very real 'enrichment' which has restored the Hosanna and the *Benedictus qui venit* in connexion with the Seraphic Hymn.

In the Prayer of Oblation, 'Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father,' the words 'looking for His second and glorious appearing,' inserted between 'we Thy humble servants' and 'do celebrate,' might be more symmetrically placed later, so as to read, 'rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, and looking for His second and glorious appearing, when He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.'

We now approach the crucial point of the whole revision—the reconstruction of the 'Epiklesis.' Here we have to consider two questions, (1) What wording should be used in the

actual petition for an operation of the Holy Spirit on the elements? and (2) How should that petition be connected with a dependent petition for the spiritual benefit of the communicants?

In order to make the ground clear, we will exhibit in parallelism the present Scottish form of the Invocation proper and the form as now proposed.

' . . . Of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.'

' . . . Of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with Thy Holy Spirit, this bread and this cup, that they may be the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.'

Here, first of all, we observe that 'Thy word and Holy Spirit' is simplified by the change into 'Thy Holy Spirit.' The 'word' referred to in the former reading, which came from our own First Prayer Book into the Scottish Book of 1637, is doubtless our Lord's own utterance, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' &c., although it may often have been misunderstood as if referring to Himself as 'The Word,' the rather that the words of institution are not directly or properly the Father's, to whom 'Thy' of course refers. If the two ideas of the efficacy of the words of institution and of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit's operation were to be combined in a single phrase, it might certainly have been better done. The Scottish Bishops now propose to drop all allusion in this place to the words of institution, probably because the prayer in question looks to the future, whereas the formula of institution has been already pronounced, the Scottish Liturgy having, ever since 1755, followed the Eastern sequence, rather than that of 1549 and 1637, and placed the words of institution 'first,' the 'great oblation' second, and the Invocation third.<sup>1</sup> Again, 'these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine' is shortened into 'this bread and this cup,' which is certainly more in accordance with most of the ancient Liturgic forms, in which the two elements are mentioned severally,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We assume that this sequence is to be retained, as on the ground of Liturgical precedent it ought to be. At the same time, no one can deny that it presents some difficulty within a Church which also uses the English Communion Office; and Archdeacon Freeman wished the Scottish use to be again conformed to that of 1549 (*Guardian*, October 1, 1862).

<sup>2</sup> At the same time, the use of 'cup' in the singular at this point might seem a little awkward, when the wine had already been poured into more than one chalice for the purposes of a large communion.

the collective form being traceable to the Roman Canon, in which they are contemplated as constituting one 'oblation.' 'Hanc igitur oblationem . . . placatus accipias. . . . Quam oblationem . . . benedictam . . . facere digneris, ut *nobis* Corpus et Sanguis *fiat*,' &c.

But now for what is more momentous. Until 1764, the Scottish Liturgy retained the wording of 1549 and 1637, 'That they may be unto us the Body,' &c., where the verb 'be' is put instead of 'become,' the *fiat* of the ancient Canon, and 'unto us' is retained as equivalent to its *nobis*. In 1764 Bishops Falconar and Forbes altered 'be unto us' into 'become.' It is now proposed, not indeed to restore 'be unto us,' but to substitute 'be' simply for 'become.'

It is obvious that, in attempting an estimate of this proposal, we have not only to compare 'be' with 'become' absolutely, as might have been necessary or desirable when the recension of 1764 was being put forth, but to consider whether, now that 'become' has been the word used by the Scottish Church for a hundred and twenty-six years, there is sufficient reason for superseding it by 'be.'

Two reasons are adduced in support of this change: one is that 'be' adheres more closely to the *ipsissima verba* of the Institution. 'We have aimed,' say the Bishops in their explanatory Pastoral, 'at coming as closely as the precatory form will admit to the very word used by our Blessed Lord Himself. He did not say, "This *has become*,"—but, "This *is* My Body;" and similarly we pray not that the Bread and the Cup *may become*, but that they *may be* His Body and His Blood. In the selfsame sense, and in no other sense than that in which the Lord . . . declared the Bread and the Cup *to be* His Body and His Blood, we pray that the Bread and the Cup *may be* His Body and His Blood.'

On this, which had been hinted in Dr. Dowden's book, we would observe that '*is*' represents a condition or state of things, and '*may be*' must be taken in the same sense. But when we contemplate such a condition as an object in the future, we naturally express ourselves as wishing that it *may be* produced; and for this purpose the appropriate verb would be 'become.' When a change is in prospect, we look forward to its taking place; we speak of *that* in the first instance, rather than of the condition which it will inaugurate; and if it is a question of prayer, we pray definitely for it. Thus, in the Baptismal Office, the Church prays, 'Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he *may be* born again and *be made* an heir of everlasting salvation,' in

other words, that by virtue of the sacrament to be presently administered, he may *become* a child of God ; and this in perfect consistency with the subsequent assertion, ‘This child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ’s Church.’ The force and vividness of the prayer would be weakened if the mind were made to rest on the regenerate condition simply, rather than on the Divine act which is first to produce it ; that is, if we were to say, ‘that he may be an heir of salvation.’ Why should not this common-sense principle be applied to the Eucharistic Invocation ? It was so applied in almost all the forms of that Invocation, until 1549. We proceed to give some instances.

The so-called Clementine, or Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions, reads—<sup>1</sup>

‘That He may *constitute* (*ἀποφίγῃ*) this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ.’

Greek St. James—

‘That He may hallow and *make* this bread the holy Body,’ &c.

Syriac St. James—

‘That by His coming He may *make* this bread the lifegiving Body,’ &c.

In the numerous Liturgies of the Syrian class the usual form is ‘may *make*,’ or ‘*render*, this bread the Body, and this cup,’ or, ‘the mixture that is in this cup, the Blood,’ &c. In some the more emphatic verbs, to ‘perfect’ or ‘consummate,’ are used. In two—which is germane to the point before us—‘*become*’ is actually used ; thus, in the Syriac St. Chrysostom—‘Let this bread and this wine *become* one Body and Blood ;’ and Severus—‘That this bread may *become* the Body.’<sup>2</sup>

In the Greek Liturgy of St. Basil—

‘That Thy Holy Spirit . . . may *constitute* (*ἀναθεῖξαι*) this bread the precious Body itself of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ (R. Amen), and this cup the precious Blood itself of, &c. (R. Amen), which was shed for the life of the world (R. Amen).’

<sup>1</sup> Ἀποφάινω, like ἀναδείκνυμι, ‘to display’ comes to mean ‘to display as appointed or constituted,’ and so ‘to constitute or appoint.’ See Origen, c. *Cels.* v. 14; Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 30; and another passage in the ‘Clementine,’ Hammond’s *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* ii. 246, 325. In the Syriac of St. James, as translated by Mr. Howard, ‘thoroughly make’ is used as to the chalice (*The Christians of St. Thomas and their Liturgies*, p. 231).

Similarly, St. Chrysostom's—

'Send down Thy Holy Spirit . . . and *make* (*ποίησον*) this bread the precious Body, &c., and that which is in this cup the precious Blood, &c., changing them by thy Holy Spirit.'

The Armenian—

'Shed abroad . . . Thy Spirit . . . whereby Thou wilt *make* (or, so as to *make*) the bread, when blessed, truly the Body, &c. . . .'

This is repeated over the cup, and again over both elements. The Liturgy of St. Mark, as is well known, has a very elaborate and magnificent Invocation, evidently composed as a protest against Macedonianism. In it, again, the word *make* is employed, as in the Coptic Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Gregory, and St. Cyril, and in the Alexandrian Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Gregory.<sup>1</sup> The Ethiopic keeps the same phrase : 'That He (the Holy Spirit) may *make* both (the bread and the cup) the Body and Blood,' &c.

Of the so-called Nestorian Liturgies,<sup>2</sup> that of SS. Adæus and Maris is singular as asking simply for the benediction and sanctification of the elements by the Holy Spirit, that they may be to the receivers for a propitiation, &c., very much in the manner of the present American Liturgy. But the Liturgy of Nestorius has 'Let the grace of the Holy Spirit . . . *make* this bread and cup the Body and Blood,' and that of Theodore reads, 'Let this bread *become* the Body,' &c.

Of various Gallican Invocations we may take as samples : 'That to all receivers it may *be* a legitimate Eucharist ;' 'And let it *become* to us a legitimate Eucharist ;' 'That our oblation may *become* a spiritual sacrifice.'<sup>3</sup> In the first of these cases it will be observed that we find, for the first time, the word 'be,' and this occurs in two Masses of the 'Missale Richenovense,' and also in the Gothic Missal for Easter Eve. But the same Missal has 'become' in the third of the clauses just quoted, which occurs in its 'post secreta' for the Circumcision. In another passage where *sit* occurs, the context has two words expressive of 'change,'<sup>4</sup> much as in the Roman 'Benedictio Fontis' such words as '*Sit* fons vivus, aqua regenerans,' are, so to speak, accentuated by 'Qui hanc aquam

<sup>1</sup> Renaudot, i. 16, 31, 48, 69, 106. In the two Liturgies of St. Gregory the word 'change' is also used.

<sup>2</sup> Properly, those of the 'Assyrians' or 'East Syrians,' the poor remains of the old Nestorian communion, among whom Archbishop Benson's mission-priests are at work. There is no Nestorianism in two, at any rate, of these Liturgies.

<sup>3</sup> Forbes's *Gallican Liturgies*, pp. 4, 11, 15, 153.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 8.

. . . arcanâ sui numinis admixtione foecundet,' or 'totamque hujus aquæ substantiam regenerandi foecundet effectu,' &c.

As Dr. Neale remarks in his *Essays on Liturgiology*, the Mosarabic Liturgy now retains only traces here and there of the Eucharistic Invocation; but he adduces one as specially clear, from the service for the Fifth Sunday in Lent—

'That Thou wouldest pour from heaven upon these sacrifices the dew of Thy Holy Spirit, that this sacrifice may be made (*fiat*), according to the order of Melchisedech.'

We have already mentioned the *fiat* in the Roman 'Quam oblationem,' where the operation of the Holy Spirit is not expressed, but implied. In the Ambrosian, as sanctioned by Carlo Borromeo, '*fiat*' simply occurs in the first oblation,<sup>1</sup> and '*nobis fiat*' in the Canon.

It will be evident from this brief survey, that in contexts parallel to the Scottish Invocation the Liturgical rule, to which there are but very few exceptions, is to use some verb indicative of the process rather than of the result. 'Make,' 'render,' 'constitute' are in this point of view analogous to 'become.'<sup>2</sup> We need not, therefore, dwell on the fact that the very word 'become' occurs in a few of the liturgies of the separated Eastern communions, as well as in those of Rome and Milan. Independently of this, we are in a position to say that the vastly preponderating mass of liturgical precedent gives no encouragement to the substitution of 'be' for 'become,' and that if the Scottish Church were to make that substitution she could not afterwards consistently assert that she was faithful, on principle, to ancient liturgical standards. And we may now repeat that the question is not of the adoption of the term which better represents liturgical tradition, but of its abandonment. It is now in possession; the proposal is that it should be dispossessed. Cause has to be shown, we respectfully submit, for such a measure. No such cause can be found in grammatical propriety. No such cause can be found in ancient and widespread liturgical use. On the contrary, considerations of these two kinds would plead strongly for its retention. Nor is it here inopportune to remark, that for the Scottish Church at this time advisedly to expunge the term from her Liturgy might be understood as casting a slur on the language of the greatest bishop who ever, by deeds and sufferings yet more than by words, made good the inex-

<sup>1</sup> 'Suscite . . . Pater, hunc panem sanctum, ut *fiat* unigeniti tui Corpus. . . . Suscite . . . Pater, hunc calicem . . . ut *fiat* . . . Sanguis.'

<sup>2</sup> So says Bishop Dowden explicitly (*Ann. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 340).

hausti  
Lord

'W  
the br  
Jesus

Or if  
teenth  
to An  
the 'I  
Bishop  
*Comm*  
tended  
hibite

'T  
these  
(Amen)  
(Amen)

TH  
are qu  
Taylor  
publis  
the Br  
shall I  
to the  
the Sc  
sponsi  
propose  
in the  
has sh  
so far  
recent  
that th  
to the  
been i  
the O

'C  
fully a  
years  
accept  
fourtee

<sup>1</sup> F

<sup>2</sup> T

Book, T

haustible assurance: 'Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord shall fight for thee.' For thus writes St. Athanasius:—

'When the great and wondrous prayers have been finished, then the bread *becomes* the Body, and the cup the Blood, of our Lord Jesus Christ.'<sup>1</sup>

Or if it be thought that an Anglican divine of the seventeenth century is practically a better authority with a view to Anglican requirements than even the most illustrious of the 'Fathers,' we may adduce a passage to which the present Bishop of Edinburgh called attention in his *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, from a certain 'Collection of Offices intended for use when the use of the Prayer-book was prohibited during the Usurpation':—

'That . . . He (the Holy Ghost) . . . may bless and sanctify these gifts, that this bread may *become* the holy Body of Christ (Amen), and this chalice may *become* the lifegiving Blood of Christ (Amen).'<sup>2</sup>

The compiler of the Invocation from which these words are quoted was Bishop Jeremy Taylor. But it may be said that Taylor in his 'advertisement' desired that the prayers then published 'might no longer be used in any public place than the Bishops upon prudent inquiries and grave considerations shall perceive them apt to minister to God's glory, and useful to the present or future necessities of the Church'; and that the Scottish bishops, acting under the deepest sense of responsibility, have brought forward as their main reason for proposing the change in question the very 'grave consideration' that 'needless offence has been caused by the introduction in the latter half of the last century, of a word which experience has shown to be liable to grave misunderstanding.' They go so far as to call the word 'a stumbling-block of comparatively recent introduction,' and affirm that 'there can be little doubt that the strong objection (*whether reasonable or otherwise*) felt to the use of the one word "become" in the Invocation has been the chief hindrance to the more general acceptance of the Office.'

'Comparatively recent introduction.' Is this, we respectfully ask, the most natural phrase to apply, within twelve years of the end of this century, to a term introduced and accepted when the second half of the last century was but fourteen years old? The bishops doubtless give the exact

<sup>1</sup> Fragm. 7: from a sermon, *Eἰς τοὺς Βαπτιζομένους*.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor's Works, viii. 624. Following the precedent of the First Book, Taylor places the Invocation before the words of Institution.

date, 1764, in an intermediate paragraph of their Pastoral ; but supposing that, for instance, the words 'and oblations,' which were added to our own Liturgy at the last 'review,' had been called in 1786, by way of disparagement, a phrase of 'comparatively recent introduction,' would such a description have been received by English Churchmen as strictly appropriate?

Let it be remembered that the term was part of the office as earnestly recommended to Seabury by his Scottish consecrators ; that it stands in his own Office as drawn up for Connecticut ;<sup>1</sup> that Bishop Abernethy Drummond only proposed to read, 'may become the *spiritual Body*' &c. ; and that his proposals obtained no 'formal sanction.'

But now as to the substantial objection which it is proposed to meet by the sacrifice of the term. The bishops, in words which we have italicized, intimate that it may or may not be thought 'reasonable.' They do not commit themselves to an admission of its reasonableness. One of them, who is eminent as a theologian and a liturgist, has distinctly affirmed that the term is '*not*, in fairness, open to the objection sometimes made to it.'<sup>2</sup> One of their predecessors—a prelate who certainly has had no superior in the Scottish episcopate for accuracy of mind and judicial deliberateness of statement—we mean the late Bishop Terrot of Edinburgh—wrote as follows on this very question :—

'To me it appears that *become* is equivalent to *come to be*, and that we are more likely to state correctly' [he meant, for liturgic purposes] 'the doctrine of the Eucharist when, without note or comment, we adopt the expression of Him who . . . said, This *is* My Body.'<sup>3</sup>

Bishop Terrot, therefore, was prepared to uphold the term 'become' as correct, and would not have admitted the position implied in the Pastoral, that 'become,' *in such a context*, is other than a faithful representation of our Lord's own word 'is.' But let us ask why it is called a stumbling-block? The answer must be, Because many persons think that it involves the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. Can any intelligent Scottish Churchman who knows the great central text, St. John i. 14, assume that A cannot 'become' B without, *ipso*

<sup>1</sup> See the very interesting reprint of that Office by Professor Hart, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop Dowden, *Ann. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 339. He also cites Wheatly, Thorndike, and Bull, as 'writers of approved repute among Anglican theologians,' who 'do not scruple to use, or accept, the word.'

<sup>3</sup> *Scottish Ecclesiastical Gazette* (for 1851), vol. i. 89. Quoted in *C. Q. R.* xxiii. 357, and by Bishop Dowden.

*facto*, ceasing to be A? 'When,' says St. Chrysostom, 'you hear that the Word *became* flesh, be not disturbed . . . for that essence did not change into flesh,—it were impiety to imagine this!—but, continuing what it was, it so took on it the form of a servant.'<sup>1</sup> Will it not be rather a questionable step, and rather a dangerous precedent, if a Church which is nothing if not theological were practically to encourage a most untheological and most disastrous mistake, by withdrawing a term in deference to the assumption that it implied, as a consequence, the *desitio panis et vini* in those elements as to which our Lord's words, by supposition, had come true? And might there not be reason to apprehend that the withdrawal would be claimed as a virtual concession to those whose view of the Eucharist excludes *any* conception of a sacramental change as much as it excludes that particular notion of the change which Rome, to her great embarrassment, has based upon an obsolete theory? In short, will not the proposed substitution be welcome, in a 'lowering' sense, to those who believe in no Presence that is other than subjective? And will not such a result be precisely the most disappointing result to the Bishops themselves, who repeatedly, in their Pastoral, protest that they have intended to 'preserve with scrupulous fidelity every doctrinal truth' contained in 'the Scottish Office'?

Still, it will be said, these prejudices, call them untheological or unreasonable as you will, do in fact exist; and while they exist, the object which the Bishops have at heart—that of undoing the wrong done by the Synod of 1862–3 to the Scottish Office,<sup>2</sup> by placing it, at least, on a level of equality with the English Office—will be found in fact unattainable. You may regret it, but you cannot help it; something must be done to remove the stumbling-block. What can you suggest, if you dislike the Bishops' suggestion?

We have not learned that in all cases '*something* must be done' to abate misapprehensions or to conciliate opposition. Scripture indicates that in certain cases, if men ignorantly turn corner-stones into stumbling-blocks, they must be left to find out their own error. The 'stone' itself is not to be straightway removed. But we would suggest that, if the dis-

<sup>1</sup> St. Chrys. in *Joan. Ev. Hom.* xi. As Dr. Pusey says, 'The Fathers had often to insist that "the Word *became* flesh," not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God' (*Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 234).

<sup>2</sup> 'There is no disguising the fact that the Synod of 1862–3 dishonoured and degraded the . . . Scottish rite in a way very painful to the feelings of those who admire and love it.' Bishop Dowden, *Annot. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 21.

satisfaction to be considered is simply that of persons who, for want of knowledge or of thought, imagine that the elements cannot with any propriety be said to 'become the Body and Blood of Christ' unless they cease to be bread and wine—if, as we not only suppose for argument's sake, but earnestly believe, there is no question of attempting to satisfy those who, from their own standpoint, cannot be satisfied with any 'higher' Eucharistic theory than that of Calvinism—then we submit that it would be possible, without sacrificing 'become' or some equivalent phrase, to abate, *ad majorem cautelam*, the prejudice above referred to. With all possible deference we would ask the Scottish bishops to consider whether some such form as the following might not meet the purpose, and at the same time—a point by no means to be underrated, for indeed it is momentous—might allay the anxiety and distress which is, as a plain matter of fact, really felt and expressed by those who for many years have used and loved the Office as revised in 1764, and who surely deserve as much consideration as any whom it may be desired to conciliate.<sup>1</sup>

'... Of Thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy Holy Spirit this bread and this cup, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, according to the purpose of His holy institution.'

Or, if it were thought better to combine the verb generally used in Eastern Liturgies with the verb actually used by our Lord Himself, the wording might be—

'... make them to be the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, according to the purpose,' &c.

But Bishop Dowden remarks that Bishop Rattray proposed a form based on the Liturgy of St. James: 'that He (Thy Holy Spirit) may make this bread the holy Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ';<sup>2</sup> and at p. 20 he favours a 'close approach' to that Liturgy. A similar distinctness of reference to the two elements appears in Bishop Wilson's private form, adopted from the 'Clementine'—'beseeching Thee to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ,'<sup>3</sup> &c.—and on Biblical as well as liturgical grounds

<sup>1</sup> 'To thousands the Scottish Communion Office is endeared by the tenderest associations and most sacred memories. For them it needs no laboured apologies. The most precious gifts of God have come to them through that channel, and they know it.'—Bishop Dowden, *Annot. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Annot. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 16.      <sup>3</sup> *Sacra Privata*, p. 106, ed. 1853.

there is much to be said for it. If it were adopted, the Invocation might run thus, after 'we most humbly beseech Thee':—

'And let Thy Spirit, by His sanctifying presence, *make* this bread to be the Body of Thy Son, and this cup to be His Blood, according to the purpose,' &c.

In any case, we venture to think that the words which we have italicized, referring to our Lord's own 'purpose,' would reassure any minds that might be troubled with the fear of a Romeward tendency in the clause preceding; and we would also suggest that the retention of 'become,' or the adoption of 'make them to be,' which is substantially equivalent, as 'be' simply is *not*, would be all the more desirable in view of the next change proposed, as to which we have no serious criticism to offer.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Dowden five years ago laid great stress on the peculiar 'abruptness' of the Scottish Invocation, as not standing in close verbal connexion with a petition for beneficial results.<sup>2</sup> It was to this, rather than to the use of the word 'become,'

<sup>1</sup> While these pages are passing through the press we are informed of the expression of an opinion that 'if the Epiklesis of the Scottish Liturgy is "still" to follow the words of institution, the words "be unto us" are to be preferred to "be" or "become."' But this raises a question: What, in the view of the Scottish Church, is the purpose or object of the Epiklesis? Is it in order that the Consecration may be consummated, or that the communicants may be enabled to receive with profit? No doubt it was natural for Bickell, as a Roman Catholic, to put the latter interpretation on the Eastern Epiklesis: but it is certain that properly and historically the Invocation was used in the former sense as a prayer that the Sacrament might be fully constituted, and we presume that this sense has hitherto been the one received among Scottish Churchmen. If, then, the Scottish Invocation, standing where it now does, is to be read 'be unto us,' it is inevitable that the Consecration will be understood as merely contemplating a 'relative presence,' dependent on and resulting from the due disposition of the individual communicant. If 'be unto us,' when it stood before the Words of Institution, was sometimes so understood, how much more will this be the case when it comes after the words of institution, and after the oblation? The effect will be to encourage a confusion between the 'inward part' and the 'benefits,' which would reduce the 'Presence' to a purely subjective operation. And who will be the gainers then? It is hardly necessary to add that a combination of 'be unto us' with the present position of the Invocation is wholly without precedent in liturgical antiquity. If 'be unto us' is to be restored—which, for fear of the misconstruction already referred to, we strongly deprecate—let the Invocation, at any rate, be restored to the position which it held in 1549 and 1637, the position held by the *Quam oblationem* of the Roman Liturgy.

<sup>2</sup> 'It is introduced abruptly; it is passed from abruptly; it stands in nakedness and baldness that has no parallel' (*Annot. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 15). Surely this is rather over-stringent.

that he attributed the main stress of a prejudice against the Scottish Office which he did not shrink from calling 'culpable.' He concluded his book with the words, 'It is *not* in the employment of the word "become" that the divergence of the Scottish Communion Office from the ancient Liturgies strikes upon the senses of the reader.' There needs no proof, for there can be no doubt, that the Eastern Liturgies do very closely link the petition referred to with the Invocation as relating to the elements. They ask, 'Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts,' &c.; and after the words, 'the precious blood of Thy Christ,' or words to the same effect, they at once proceed in terms which may be represented by the language of St. James's Liturgy, as rendered by Bishop Dowden :—

'That they may be<sup>1</sup> to all who partake of them unto the remission of sins and unto everlasting life, unto sanctification of soul and body,' &c.

Supplications of this purpose, often much more exuberant, are represented in the Roman Liturgy by words following the mysterious petition for a carrying of the consecrated elements 'to the altar on high'<sup>2</sup>—

'That all we who, by this partaking of the altar, shall have received the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace ;'—

a supplication which had been anticipated before the words of institution by the single word *nobis*, often strangely misunderstood as if it implied a merely 'relative presence.' Dr. Dowden guards against such a misconception; that 'part of the formula which refers to the purport of the change prayed for is in my judgment identical in intention with the "ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat" of the Roman Canon' (p. 17). 'The conclusion of the passage' in the 'Clementine' (*īva oī μεταλάβοντες αὐτοῦ βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς εὐσεβίαν, κ.τ.λ.*) 'is in effect the Greek equivalent to the *nobis* of the Latin formula' (p. 214).

We observed in our number for January 1887 that a petition for such results of Communion was, in fact, contained in the next sentence but one to the Scottish Invocation, 'That

<sup>1</sup> Properly, 'become a means of obtaining,' *īva γένηται . . . eis ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν κ.τ.λ.* Compare the Liturgies of St. Mark, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom. Bishop Wilson's prayer, quoted above, proceeds, 'And that all we who are partakers thereof may thereby obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.'

<sup>2</sup> In the third part of the fourth prayer of the Canon (*supplices Te*).

the  
le.  
em-  
the  
akes  
ere  
ely  
ing  
spirit  
the  
ect,  
by  
hop

ision  
dy,

ant,  
ing  
ited

re-  
with

ords  
nis-  
Dr.  
t of  
ayed  
"ut  
17).  
.iwa  
.A.)  
atin

t a  
ed in  
hat

eguy  
St.  
that  
our

Te).

whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood . . . and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, &c.,' and that it would be easy to join these words on to the Invocation proper. The bishops now propose to read, after 'Thy most dearly beloved Son,'

'That so whosoever shall receive the same may be sanctified both in soul and body, and preserved unto everlasting life. And we earnestly desire,' &c.

'That so' is preferable to 'so that,' which might—we do not say that it would—be understood in a sense which would confound the 'inward part' with the 'benefits.' 'That so,' of course, means 'to the end that thereby,' which is the sense of *lva* in the corresponding Greek clauses; but if 'make to be' were used, 'that' might suffice in the clause respecting 'benefits.' Perhaps there is in the words proposed a needless anticipation of the formula of administration; perhaps it would have been simpler to transpose some of the words following on 'a reasonable, holy, and lively<sup>1</sup> sacrifice unto Thee' from their present place to the place now under consideration; but these are points of detail. The point of real importance is that the Liturgy will be improved by a nearer conformity, in this respect, to the Eastern types; but that if the petition for benefits is thus put into juxtaposition with the Invocation, it will be all the more important to retain in the Invocation words which will represent the reality of the sacramental change. As Mr. Hammond says, the 'two petitions for the change of the elements and for the spiritual benefits are always contained' in the Eastern rites, but 'are kept markedly distinct.'<sup>2</sup>

In the subsequent prayer for the Church, the anticlimax of a prayer 'for acceptance of alms and oblations' after the completion of the consecration is most properly avoided. We think it might be a gain, and certainly could not be an

<sup>1</sup> The revised draft rightly alters this into 'living.' The words referred to are, 'that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them and they in Him.' We would suggest that immediately after the actual 'Epiklesis,' worded in one of the alternative forms given above, the sentence might go on, 'that so (or, if 'make to be' were used, 'that') whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive *that* precious Body and Blood, and be filled . . . in Him. And we earnestly desire . . . benefits of His Passion. And although we are unworthy,' &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Lit. Eastern and Western*, p. xxxvi.

offence, if on a Saint's day the name of the Saint were to be mentioned in the commemoration of the 'choice vessels of grace and lights of the world.'

In the rubric about administration, the celebrant ought surely no longer to be directed, when making his own Communion, to address himself in the second person, 'which was given for thee,' &c. A sense of almost grotesque incongruity is the last thing to be tolerated at so solemn a moment. Of course he ought to say 'for me,' 'my body.'

We are glad that the 'Clementine' exhortation, 'Having now received,' is not to be absolutely omitted, as was at first proposed, but to be turned into a Post-communion collect. But, as thus recast, it is perhaps not quite sufficiently rhythmical. It might be better to read, 'Having now received the precious Body and Blood of Christ, we thank Thee, O Lord our God, who hast graciously vouchsafed,' &c. 'Thy most dearly beloved Son' is needlessly repeated from the Invocation; and as our Lord is mentioned in the first part of the prayer, 'the same' should, as usual, be inserted before His name in the imperative close, 'through the merits of the all-sufficient sacrifice of the same our Lord Jesus Christ.'

The adoption of the English and American 'prepared for us,' instead of 'commanded us,' in the collect 'Almighty and everliving God,' will commend itself to every reader who has in mind St. Paul's phrase in Eph. ii. 10.

The two collects taken from the 'Book of Deer,' as 'the solitary liturgical relic that has come down to us from the Celtic Church of Scotland,' are interesting in that point of view, but have no particular merit. In the first, 'we have celebrated these sacred mysteries' might as well be slightly altered, on account of the present restricted use of that verb in regard to the Eucharistic service. The second, as translated, is singularly cumbrous in construction :

'From amid the unwearied praises of Cherubim and Seraphim who stand around Thy throne of light, which no man can approach unto, give ear, we humbly beseech Thee, to the supplications of Thy people who put their sure trust in Thy mercy.'

Surely this wants retouching ; such a sentence could not be repeated without a gasp. The collect relating to the Last Judgment—adapted from a hymn called 'Altus Prosator,' 'attributed,' says Bishop Reeves,<sup>1</sup> to St. Columba while yet in Ireland—is really very commonplace. Allowing for the archaic interest of such 'liturgical relics,' is it not clear that

<sup>1</sup> In his edition of Adamnan, p. 253.

such considerations are of no account when the best accessible prayers are needed? And were not Celtic prayer-makers but prentice-hands (and small blame to them) in comparison of the great masters from whose matchless work—the Latin Sacramentaries—our Reformers and revisers have borrowed much, and might with great advantage have borrowed more? We are sure that the Bishop of Edinburgh could at once suggest two or three gems in the Leonine and Gelasian treasuries which would ‘enrich’ the crown of Scottish liturgical worship.

But here we will make an end. We shall have expressed ourselves but ill, if it is not clear that we deem this revision to be, in the greater number of instances, a very real improvement. Such criticisms as we have felt bound to make are commended, with much respect, to the ‘benignant interpretation’ of the Right Reverend Prelates by whom the work has thus far been executed; and on the point which they themselves acknowledge to be the most crucial, we humbly entreat consideration for a suggestion which we honestly believe would be a solution of present difficulties, and a safeguard against future dissension.<sup>1</sup> Would there not be time for a further ‘revision’ before the meeting of the General Synod? Or, considering the great importance of the subject, in view of the liturgical future of the whole Anglican Communion, would it not be well to *make* time for such a purpose?

<sup>1</sup> We have forbore to touch on one point, in regard to which we think that the Scottish Liturgy might with great advantage be conformed to our own. We mean the position of the Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words. Surely they come far better before the *Sursum corda* than, as in the Scottish rite at present (though not in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637), almost immediately before the actual Communion. Here, too, we think the Bishop of Edinburgh would be with us. ‘It may well be questioned,’ he says, ‘whether, in liturgical propriety, the Confession and Absolution should not come before the Consecration, as in the American and English offices’ (*Ann. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 220). If they were to be so placed, a slight alteration should be made in the wording of the ‘Invitation’: for, in our own book, ‘this holy Sacrament’ sounds awkwardly before the Consecration. On the other hand, the place of the collect of Humble Access, just before Communion, in the Scottish Liturgy, is exactly appropriate; it thus represents the beautiful prayer, ‘O Lord our God, the Heavenly Bread,’ in St. James’s Liturgy.

## ART. III.—ANNALS OF THE 'LOW CHURCH PARTY.'

*Annals of the 'Low Church' Party in England down to the Death of Archbishop Tait.* By the Rev. W. H. B. PROBY, M.A., author of *Letters on Christian Religion*, &c. 2 vols. (London, 1888.)

THE subject of these volumes is beyond all question one of deep interest to Church people, but just in proportion to its interest is the importance of its being treated, if treated at all, in a sober, scholarly, and strictly fair way ; otherwise its treatment by a High Churchman is calculated to do far more harm than good to the cause advocated in these pages. Whether, in our opinion, Mr. Proby has or has not so treated it will appear in the sequel. Let us first specify the points on which we are to a certain extent at one with him. And first as to the title of his book. He seems to be a little doubtful about it himself, but in our opinion he is quite right in terming his subject 'the Low Church Party.' He could not, as he rightly says, call it the Evangelical party without implying that he is himself *not* Evangelical, 'which no minister of Christ could for a moment admit without denying his own principles' (Pref.). 'Puritan,' perhaps, would be nearer the mark ; but this term would be at once too wide and too narrow—too wide, for it would include such sects as the Brownists, the Congregationalists, the Anabaptists, and the Methodists, none of whom are at all the sort of people of whom Mr. Proby proposes to give us the annals ; too narrow, for it would exclude such names as those of the present Archbishop of York and the late Archbishop of Canterbury, the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and the late Bishop of Manchester, and many others of whom Mr. Proby has much to say ; while it would but very imperfectly represent even those in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who had most in common with the Puritans of the sixteenth and seventeenth. The two obvious objections to the term 'Low Church' are (1) the ugliness of the word, which is, as Mr. Proby says, 'a badly-shaped adjective' (Pref.) ; (2) the necessity of its being used proleptically of nearly half the time over which Mr. Proby's volumes range. But if it expresses what the author means to express, as we think it does, these objections are of quite minor importance. How the term arose is, as he says, not very certain, but we can give him

approximately the date of its rise. The terms 'High Church' and 'Low Church' were certainly not in use at the time of the Restoration, nor for some years after ; they certainly were in very general use some years before the seventeenth century closed : so this narrows the date of their origin to within about twenty years—that is, between 1670 and 1690. He also says that he does not know when the definition was given of a 'Low Churchman' as a Churchman who has a low opinion of the Church in comparison with himself, and of a 'High Churchman' as one who has a high opinion of the Church in a like comparison. It was given, we believe, by the Rev. Charles Leslie, and will be found in the *Rehearsals*.

Mr. Proby begins his *Annals* by pointing out that Protestantism, both in England and abroad, was an intellectual rather than a religious movement. 'What of religion appeared in it arose from the removal of those fetters by which the intellect had been hindered from exercising itself in a religious way' (i. 3). He then draws a distinction between two works which had to do with that very vague event termed the 'Reformation' in England—'the one a work of reformation, the other a work tending to destruction and substitution ; the one a simple clearing away of abuses and errors both in doctrine and practice, the other an introduction of formal heresy (the Zwinglian) ; the one in origin English, the other foreign' (i. 7), and so forth. These two theories, though stated too broadly by Mr. Proby, are, we believe, in the main correct as matters of history, and it is of importance that true Churchmen should thoroughly grasp them both.

Turning now from the Reformation era to what may be termed the Revival era in the eighteenth century, we think that Mr. Proby has on the whole taken a correct estimate of the first race of Evangelicals. He touches but quite lightly upon John Wesley. And in this he is right ; for, in the first place, whether he would or not, John Wesley's efforts tended to produce Methodists, not 'Low Churchmen ;' a sect without, not a party within, the pale of the Church of England ; and, secondly, whatever John Wesley was he was not a Low Churchman ; the whole tone of his mind, as well as his direct theology, was of quite a different type, as Canon Overton has shown in the *English Church in the Eighteenth Century* and in his little volume in the *Epochs of Church History* series. The same may be said of Charles Wesley. Whitefield approached nearer to the Low Churchman ; but Whitefield was really a free-lance, a sort of Bashi-Bazouk of theology, if, indeed, he can be said to have had anything to

do with theology, properly so called, at all. But of the Low Churchmen proper in the eighteenth century—Venn, Newton, Scott, Cecil, the two Milners, Walker of Truro, Robinson of Leicester, Hannah More, William Wilberforce, Charles Simeon (the four last, of course, extend some way into the present century)—Mr. Proby has much to say, which may be briefly summed up thus: he admires their piety but dislikes their theology, while at the same time he admits that their piety was the result of their theology. In fact the piety of these early Evangelicals is the point on which Mr. Proby lays most stress. He divides his subject into four periods, which he terms respectively the 'pious period, the period of missionary activity, the polemical period,' and 'the immoral period.' This division shows what the whole book strives to illustrate, viz. that the Low Church party have gone on a descending scale until they have reached their lowest depths in the exploits of the Church Association.

With Mr. Proby's estimate of 'the pious period' we agree in the main. Widely as we differ from its theology—and chiefly because, as Mr. Proby is never weary of repeating, it utterly ignored the new resurrection life of Christ, the germ of which is planted in the Christian at holy baptism, and supported by the other great sacrament of the Gospel—we fully admit that, imperfect as it was, it had some precious elements of Divine truth in it, and thus produced some most beneficial effects upon the lives of its adherents and upon the nation at large. We can echo the praise which Mr. Proby bestows upon John Newton as 'a saintly old penitent' (i. 225); upon Thomas Scott as 'a man preaching practical Christianity from a sincere and upright heart, from such a heart as gives birth to upright and consistent practice' (i. 191); upon Charles Simeon for his noble disinterestedness, his regard for others and joy in their success (i. 218); upon Wilberforce and his *Practical View*;<sup>1</sup> upon Hannah More's writings, 'by which she influenced for good, and very perceptibly, the upper classes of society' (i. 244) (surely we might add, the lower also by her tracts?); upon Edward Bickersteth, 'who, by the amiability of his conduct, even towards those of opposite ways of thinking, deserved the respect with which he was regarded by his brethren of all parties' (i. 286). Nor are we at all disposed to quarrel with the excuse he makes for good

<sup>1</sup> 'Christianity, taught as it was in that book, with all its errors and mistakes, and exemplified as it was in the author's practice, could not fail to have an influence for good in proportion as the author was known; and that was more or less all over the world' (i. 236).

Mr. Walker of Truro—and by implication for many others also—for his fraternizing with Dissenters, because in an irreligious age pious people are drawn together in spite of their different opinions.

Nor do we complain of Mr. Proby's estimate of their Churchmanship. It 'was not a part of their religion; it was only an addition or appendage to it' (i. 348). 'To the Low Churchman the ordinances and appointments of the Church were but the dry posts to which he, as a young and green fruit-tree, was unavoidably fastened, and by which he imagined that his spiritual growth would, more likely than not, be hindered, as no doubt his wilfulness and party spirit were' (i. 349).

As to the missionary activity shown during the next period, that is a matter of facts and figures, which admits of no dispute. And, alas! the story which he gives with remorseless fulness and accuracy of the bitter opposition in 'the polemical period,' degenerating into downright and often unscrupulous persecution during the 'immoral period,' cannot be gainsaid. One wonders whether it ever occurs to those who more or less sanction the frantic efforts now being made to stop practices some of which, even more obviously than the practices which used to be so obnoxious, can be traced to the earliest ages, just to look back and see how their predecessors strove in vain to put a stop to usages now very generally adopted by themselves. Are they aware that at one place there were riots which all but led to bloodshed because a clergyman preached in his surplice? that a stained window was an object of alarm? that all Islington rose in arms because the Bishop of London ordered the plainest of all plain rubrics to be observed, and so far carried the day that the order had to be rescinded or suspended? that a sermon preached by Mr. Close of Cheltenham, the title of which tells its own tale, 'The Restoration of Churches, the Restoration of Popery,' was actually approved of by several dignitaries? that a churchwarden, by his own authority, removed floral decorations from the altar, decorations now so common in all churches? that from the too famous St. George's in the East the Bishop ordered the removal of choir stalls, sanctuary hangings, and a simple cross, just to satisfy a senseless anti-Popish mob, which knew and cared no more about Popery than it did about Confucianism? that a clergyman was actually inhibited for using the Invocation before sermon instead of the entirely unauthorized 'pulpit prayers,' and for wearing, not a coloured stole, but simply a

black one with crosses embroidered upon it? that the receiving the consecrated bread into the open palm instead of between the fingers was stigmatized by a learned and generally large-minded bishop as 'degrading and disgusting'? that the most innocent and sorely needed decorations of St. Paul's Cathedral were gibbeted as an attempt to convert it into a huge Jesuit church? and that these things were objected to, as many things are now, nominally because they were Popish, but really, as Mr. Proby says, because they were 'new to vulgar Protestants' (i. 472), who were encouraged by those who ought to have known better, and, we believe, *did* know better, if they had had the courage of their convictions? And this leads us to the last period. 'The immoral period' is a harsh title, but really some things have occurred which seem to justify it. What is to be said about that ugly story of charities at St. Vedast Church being used to pay expenses incurred by the Church Association against the rector? what of that monstrous utterance that private confession, so obviously enjoined under certain circumstances by the Church of England, should be made punishable by death? what of the strange story, authenticated beyond a doubt, of a Low Church clergyman describing himself anonymously as 'a great and good man'? what of the Bordesley sacrilege, which one would have thought likely to shock even those who regard the Holy Communion merely as a commemorative act, but which was actually defended by men who are rightly described as glorying in their shame? what of those organized bands of ruffians whom honest men, to say nothing of professing Christians and Churchmen, ought to have blushed to own as allies, but did not?

But surely the mere statement of the facts themselves would have been quite sufficient, and the effect is weakened rather than strengthened by the violent language in which our author expresses himself. Mr. Proby tells us in his preface that it is necessary to call a spade a spade, and we quite agree with him. But our complaint is that he does *not* call a spade a spade, but, say, 'a miserable and contemptible implement for grubbing up the dirt.' And forthwith, before his preface is ended and his narrative begun, he calls his opponents 'scoundrels,' naively appending a note to the effect that his respected publishers thought the term too strong, but he did not (Pref. vi.). One bishop (still living) 'is detested and despised' (ii. 76); another 'made a fool of himself' (i. 508). The much-lauded martyrs of the Marian days are 'the Zwinglian heretics who were executed according to the law of the land' (ii. 289); the Protestant reformers are 'Cranmer and his crew'

(i. 49  
'only  
(i. 51  
includ  
trans  
'The  
One  
(ii. 20  
its su  
Other  
abun  
an h  
garden  
self-i  
ferenc  
is qu  
Tim  
happ  
tinct  
and  
writt  
affor  
quire  
exten  
we b  
bear  
viva  
tions  
He eigh  
245.  
'the  
stir  
hear  
Mr.  
heari  
of  
foun  
natu  
ley  
all i  
pres  
of  
Josh  
Mic

(i. 492); certain clergymen who opposed another clergyman 'only showed their own ignorance, stupidity, and heresy' (i. 510). The motto of one chapter, after a list of names including Ridley, Latimer, &c., is, 'Are ye not children of transgression, a seed of falsehood?' (i. 16), and of another, 'Thou hast let thy mouth speak wickedness,' &c. (ii. 66). One periodical is described as 'over head and ears in stupidity' (ii. 260); another is a standing illustration of the fact that its supporters are 'the illiterate and stupid party' (i. 274). Other choice flowers of rhetoric might be culled in rich abundance from these pages, which are utterly unworthy of an historian. But the fact is, Mr. Proby can hardly be regarded as an historian. An historian should show more self-restraint, and should also draw his materials from different sources, and digest and condense them better. He is quite a walking dictionary in the literature of the *Church Times*, the *Rock*, the *Record* (which, by the way, has now happily adopted a far more kindly, charitable, and indeed distinctly Church, tone than it did twenty or thirty years ago), and the *Christian Observer*; but such ephemeral productions, written under the violent excitement of the moment, rarely afford material for real history, or if they do, the material requires careful sifting. Now, these periodicals are, to a large extent, Mr. Proby's authorities; hence it is no wonder that we have some strange views of history. Thus, in order to bear out his theory that the first period of the Evangelical revival was the pious period, he makes far too sweeping assertions of the absence of piety outside the Evangelical circle. He characterises the Low Church party at the close of the eighteenth century as 'piety in the midst of ungodliness' (i. 245), the only religious people in the Church, and adds that 'the pious High Churchmen were few, and made no figure or stir at all in the eyes of the world' (i. 365). But has he never heard of that excellent band of pious Churchmen of whom Mr. Jones of Nayland was the leading spirit? Has he never heard of Mr. Jones's hero, the truly pious Bishop Horne, or of Mr. Jones's biographer, the excellent William Stevens, founder of 'Nobody's Club,' or of William Kirby, the first of naturalists and the best of Churchmen? Were Bishop Horsley and Bishop Lowth men who made 'no figure or stir at all in the eyes of the world'? And in the early part of the present century has he never heard of such names as those of Henry Handley Norris, and the two brothers Watson, Joshua and the Archdeacon, and Bishops Van Mildert, and Middleton, and Manners Sutton, and Mant, and Jebb, and

his friend and mentor Alexander Knox ; and Archdeacons Daubeny and Pott ; and Christopher Wordsworth, Master of Trinity, and other great Cambridge names—Le Bas, Blunt, Evans (author of the *Rectory of Valehead* and the *Bishopric of Souls*), and P. Lathbury, the very model of G. Herbert's *Country Parson*—and Thomas Sikes, and Mrs. Trimmer, and, we will boldly add, in spite of the Low Churchmen's claim of him, Reginald Heber? One knows not where to stop, but all we have mentioned and many more were excellent Churchmen, to whom we are indebted for many organizations for good, founded on strictly Church lines and still flourishing. The little Mr. Proby knows about them may be gathered from what he says about Archdeacon Daubeny. 'We have not read Mr. Daubeny's work (*Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*) ourselves, but we think it highly probable that Mr. Richmond has, from his standing-point, hit the nail on the head' (i. 304). Now Mr. Daubeny was worthy of far more respectful treatment. His writings were so influential that he was wittily called the 'Guide to the Church,' in allusion to the title of one of his works ; and he was as much superior to his antagonists, Mr. Overton (the Calvinistic author of *The True Churchmen Ascertained*) and Mr. Legh Richmond, as, e.g., Newman was to Kingsley in the controversy between them. And this reminds us that Mr. Proby does scant justice to Kingsley himself. With many of Mr. Kingsley's opinions, especially in his early life, we disagree as strongly as Mr. Proby himself does; but it is idle to deny that he was a vigorous thinker and a striking and suggestive writer, and that some of his later writings, especially his defence of the Athanasian Creed, were most valuable. Dr. Arnold, again, was, in our opinion, a most dangerous guide in theology, but to represent him as the head of a party which advocated natural religion and not Christianity, of a party which gave its whole attention to works of secular improvement (ii. 123), is an almost ludicrous error. Dr. Arnold's intense personal faith in, and love of, Christ was a notable feature in his life, and preserved him from many errors into which his loose theology would otherwise have led him ; and so far was he from advocating schemes of moral improvement which had no Christian sanction that he expressly and almost indignantly declined to take part in such schemes, because Christian motives were not put prominently forward.

Of the precursors of the Oxford movement Cardinal Newman himself might have taught Mr. Proby to give a more satisfactory account. He mentions indeed, though very cur-

sorily, Sir Walter Scott, Bishop Percy, and William Wordsworth (i. 399), but not one word does he say of that far more potent influence of the great thinker, poet, and philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge, whose services the Cardinal fully recognizes ; and, oh ! shade of Dean Burgon, what shall we say of the following sentence : 'The supernatural character of the ministry . . . . had been taught by the Rev. William James, Fellow of Oriel College, and also (we believe) by the Rev. Hugh James Rose, of Cambridge' (i. 400)? What a way of speaking of one who has been claimed (and there is something to be said for the claim, though we cannot altogether admit it) as the *fons et origo* of the whole movement !

To pass on to the polemical and immoral periods, which occupy nearly two-thirds of the whole book. The title of this part should have been 'The Misdoings' rather than 'The Annals' of the Low Church party, for though Mr. Proby himself admits that the persecutions were the work of only a section of the party, he dwells almost exclusively upon them, and hardly tells us one word about the good practical work which the Low Church party has undoubtedly done, or about the many instances of true, self-denying piety it has undoubtedly produced.

Nor is it of faults of omission only of which we have to complain. His faults of commission are still more glaring. The main point of his book seems to be to show that Low Churchmen have no moral right to be in the Church of England at all ; he draws, indeed, a distinction between a moral and a legal right, but that does not mend matters at all ; if they have no moral right, then their whole course is an immoral one. This is a perfectly monstrous proposition, and one which stultifies the whole argument of the Catholic party in their present distress, who contend, and contend most reasonably, that they only desire toleration, and that they have never sought, and never mean to seek, to deny that toleration to their Low Church brethren. But if Mr. Proby is to be taken as their representative it is their bounden duty to change their front ; they have no right to tolerate in the Church men who have no moral right to be there ; such toleration is a distinct weakening of the Church to which they profess to be loyal. And what are the grounds on which our author rests his sweeping charge ? Apparently that the Low Churchmen do not recognize seven sacraments, that they confound the Sabbath with the Lord's Day, and other reasons of a similar kind. Now we certainly do not agree either with the sacramental or the sabbatical views of the Low Churchmen, but to say that

they ought to be turned out of the Church (for that is really what it comes to) seems to us outrageous.

To turn from the matter to the composition of the book : We think that the work might have been advantageously compressed into one of the two bulky volumes. Needless repetitions are numerous ; some repetition was perhaps *not* needless if a full account was to be given of all the persecutions of High Churchmen ; but, as the indictments against them were mostly for the same offences, we have the same accusations recounted almost verbatim twenty or thirty times over. But, supposing that was inevitable, we might have been spared the frequent iteration of many anecdotes, and also the long quotations from the writings of H. Venn, Hannah More, W. Wilberforce, and others in the 'pious period,' their defective theology was all virtually the same, and the little shades of difference between them were hardly worth mentioning, for Mr. Proby repeats many times, and we agree with him, that not one of them has the least pretension to be termed a theologian. Why, then, fill his pages with their well-meaning but rather vapid remarks ?

Mr. Proby points out the sad waste, both of religious zeal and of good hard coin, which has been, and is still being, expended upon objects worse than useless, and which might all have been profitably employed in advancing the cause of that common Christianity in which we are all agreed. But we must confess we can scarcely conceive a book less calculated to bring about the laudable result he desires than these two volumes. To exaggerate the defects and to ignore the merits of those with whom we disagree is not the way to win them over to our side, nor to make them abandon their persecuting propensities. And, after all, we believe that the persecuting and prosecuting Low Churchmen are far from being representatives of the whole party. Anglo-Catholics can point with pardonable pride to the kindly feelings which, as a body, they have shown towards their adversaries, and to their unwillingness to retaliate upon men who have certainly laid themselves open to retaliation. This, in the long run, will prove the wisest, as it is certainly the most Christian, policy, and we deeply regret any indications of the appearance of a different spirit.

## ART. IV.—METHODS OF TRUTH-SEEKING.

1. *On Truth: a Systematic Inquiry.* By ST. GEORGE MIVART, Ph.D., M.D., F.R.S. (London, 1889.)
2. *What is Truth?* By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. (Edinburgh, 1889.)
3. *Dependence: or the Insecurity of the Anglican Position.* By the Rev. LUKE RIVINGTON, M.A. (London, 1889.)
4. *The Infallibility of the Church.* A Course of Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Dublin. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. (London, 1888.)
5. *Science and the Faith.* Essays on Apologetic Subjects. With an Introduction, By AUBREY L. MOORE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. (London, 1889.)

THESE books, though various indeed in their character, have this common bond: that they are concerned with the subject of primary truth, what it is and how to seek it. It is in this point of view that we intend to regard them. Therefore the account which we shall be able to give of some of them will be very inadequate, except in reference to the bearing which it has upon our special subject. This, however, will not be of the less consequence, since two of them have been treated at large in our last number.

The work of Mr. Mivart is, we confess, extremely different from what we expected before we opened its pages. We were aware that this able writer had been engaged in controversy as to the consistency of his claims to absolute freedom in scientific research with sincere adherence to the Roman Catholic faith. We expected that the extensive treatise now in our hands would have defended his position with greater completeness than was possible in contributions to the monthly Reviews. We were quite mistaken. The book is a statement at large of man's natural knowledge and of man's own place in nature. Although it does prepare the way for religion, yet it does not directly discuss religion, much less any particular form of it. And it concerns the author's religious position only thus far: that by treating so comprehensive a subject in all its branches, without the slightest allusion to any ecclesiastical restrictions or assistances, it implies an opinion that in this wide range of knowledge, in contact with human life at every point, the Church has nothing to say.

But we have no title to expect that Mr. Mivart would take

the line most in accordance with our anticipations. We feel ourselves more within our rights in objecting that the character of the work is hardly such as its own name would have led us to expect. What does the title 'On Truth' lead us to look for? Surely not a catalogue of truths either natural or revealed, but an inquiry into the essential nature of truth, to which all particular truths must conform. We have read but a few lines in Mr. Mivart's first chapter when we discover that this is not his conception of the work before him.

'The popular pursuit of truth,' he says, 'is mainly an indirect pursuit of it. It is not, after all, so much a pursuit of "truth" as a pursuit of "truths." It is not the endeavour to discover what is most certain and fundamental in all knowledge, but an endeavour to become acquainted with facts and laws of different branches of knowledge. There is one very important difference between these two quests : a student of any branch of science must, if he would succeed, follow the footsteps of its masters, and, at least provisionally, abide by their dicta. . . . In the pursuit of truth itself it is otherwise. The inquirer in this case can only appeal to, and must abide by, the declarations of his own reason' (p. 4).

Now to our thinking the difference between 'truth' and 'truths' is not the difference between what is fundamental or essential and the facts and laws of different branches : nor yet between what we know by our reason and what we know by authority. Facts known to us by our own reason are just as much particular truths as those which we accept on the authority of the learned, and have just as much and just as little right to claim the singular title of Truth. Nor, indeed, is there any class of facts in respect of which we absolutely dispense with authority, or any which we absolutely accept without the exercise of our own reason. The difference is but of degree. And Mr. Mivart's own work is a testimony of this. For, commencing with elementary principles, upon which the common sense of mankind is agreed, he presently proceeds to scientific facts, which are indeed very obvious to him as a trained biologist. But the plain man, whose unsophisticated beliefs he so often defends, would never think of Mr. Mivart's scientific facts if they were not suggested to him ; and when they are, he must simply accept them on Mr. Mivart's sufficient authority. The fact is that when truth and truths are contrasted, the contrast is that of abstract and concrete. A treatise on truth should supply us with a general definition of all which can claim that lofty title : while particular facts, however ascertained, and whether widely known or known only to a few,

exer  
thisM  
caus  
the s  
as to  
(p. 1I  
page  
corre  
meta  
all d  
ledge  
judg  
appe  
ment  
certa  
opiniV  
supre  
We l  
has a  
ideali  
speci  
says'I  
we ca  
which  
it pro  
existen  
stance'N  
criticis  
ought  
absurdIs no  
to qu  
not u  
a fool  
ideali  
Mivar  
the id  
repud  
lower  
consis

feel  
cha-  
ould  
uth'  
ither  
ture  
We  
when  
before  
  
irect  
' as a  
most  
come  
edge.  
ts : a  
follow  
their  
quier  
ations  
  
' and  
tal or  
or yet  
ow by  
ust as  
n the  
ust as  
eed, is  
y dis-  
accept  
is but  
f this.  
ch the  
eds to  
a as a  
licated  
ivart's  
n they  
nt au-  
asted,  
ise on  
which  
ascer-  
a few,

exemplify in a more or less perfect degree the application of this general definition to actual things.

Mr. Mivart assures us that 'inquiries into the origin and causes of our beliefs, valuable and interesting as they are for the study of the human mind, are out of place in an inquiry as to what judgments are evidently and supremely certain' (p. 10). We cannot see it.

But even if we accept Mr. Mivart's explanation of his title page, we confess ourselves in great doubt whether his work corresponds with it. We have here a large body of teaching, metaphysical, astronomical, geological, and biological. It is all deeply interesting, conveyed as it is by a master in knowledge and expression. But if we are to take it as a list of the judgments which are 'evidently and supremely certain,' it appears to us to err both in excess and defect. Many judgments here omitted seem to us to be evidently and supremely certain, and many judgments here expressed fall short in our opinion of that description.

Was it necessary, for instance, to include among the supremely certain judgments of mankind a rejection of idealism? We know that there is an idealism which, as Mr. Moore says, has almost as bad a sound as materialism. But there is an idealism which is, to say the least, innocent. And it is this species which Mr. Mivart would seem to have in view, for he says:—

'Idealism does not contest the existence of any one thing which we can apprehend either by sensation or reflection. That things which we see with our eyes and touch with our hands do really exist, it professes in no way to question. It professes only to deny the existence in things of an unknown and unknowable underlying "substance" which supports the qualities which our senses perceive.'

'Nothing therefore,' he proceeds, 'can be more absurd than the criticisms of those persons who say that idealists, to be consistent, ought to run up against lamp-posts, fall into ditches, or commit other absurdities of the kind' (pp. 74-5).

Is not this enough for the plain man? Why compel him to question this harmless stranger whose language he does not understand, and in examining whom he is certain to make a fool of himself? No primary truth could suffer by letting idealism pass. And, if we must declare our opinion, Mr. Mivart's refutation involves that very misapprehension of the idealist position the grosser forms of which he has just repudiated. He argues that 'idealism cannot be held by followers of physical science except at the cost of their mental consistency.' Those physicists who believe that they see truth

in idealism, must in fact hold two sets of truths, one set having to do with that system and the other set having to do with physical science' (p. 78). This supposed inconsistency between idealism and physical science is rested on the ground that advocates of idealism mostly confine themselves to combating objections drawn from a consideration of our ordinary simple perceptions, while physical science has to do, not with our simple perceptions, but with systematic investigation into the causes of phenomena.

But is it not obvious that not only the question of phenomena but also the question of the causes of phenomena come up in all their essential nature in respect of those everyday perceptions which Mr. Mivart will not allow to be adduced in disproof of idealism? You must not accuse an idealist of holding principles which will bring him into collision with the lamp-post. But in making that concession you allow that he not only finds room in his system for the phenomenon lamp-post, but is also capable of recognizing the law of nature whereby this phenomenon, if brought into local connexion with the human face, is capable of causing an unpleasing phenomenon entitled bleeding at the nose.

Compare the example which Mr. Mivart himself sets in supposed opposition with idealism: namely, Leverrier's prediction of the discovery of the planet Neptune based upon the observed movements of Uranus. Leverrier's argument was that the observed phenomenon of the movements of Uranus will be followed, if certain means of observation be taken, by the appearance to man of a planet as yet unseen. But why is this argument inconsistent with idealism, while the argument that the observed phenomenon of a lamp-post will be followed, if the appropriate means be taken, by the as yet unseen phenomenon, a blow on the nose, is consistent with it? Obviously the one process is but a more elaborate form of the other; and the ideas of cause and of law arise equally in both. Mr. Herbert Spencer somewhere applies the astronomical instance which Mr. Mivart here adduces, and argues that the deer which apprehends danger upon hearing in the forest the roar of the lion, makes use of a mental process essentially the same as that by which Leverrier apprehended the presence of a planet as yet unseen from observing the motions of Uranus. It is a comparison well worth considering in reference to that distinction between the faculties of the lower animals and those of man, to which Mr. Mivart devotes many interesting pages. But this we may say here, that the difference between the lowest form of intellectual

association and the magnificent use of it which the astronomer displays is a difference which lies within the mind itself, and not in any essential distinction between the apprehension of external relations in the two cases respectively. And when you have once granted that idealism allows an apprehension of external relations sufficient to enable a man to avoid a lamp-post, the additional powers required to enable him to discover Neptune are obviously as much within the scope of idealism as of the opposite system, since they reside wholly in the internal sphere.

We refrain from calling the opposite system by the name realism, although Mr. Mivart sets us the example. The term realism in its original application had, as he himself duly mentions, a wholly different reference. And when it is used to denote the system opposite to idealism it becomes a question-begging appellative. For idealism by no means denies the reality of the external world: it only invites us to reflect what we mean by the word reality, and whether that meaning has any existence save in the world of thought. The whole phraseology in which common use describes our contact with the external world passes in all its meaning into the mouth of the idealist, and, as he would insist, derives only greater emphasis from its indissoluble connexion with the mind and spirit. Mr. Mivart's attempt (p. 81) to express physical facts in what he calls 'idealistic phraseology' is really grotesque. Idealism has no such phraseology. And the fact that since idealism became prevalent the progress of discovery in the laws of nature has proceeded at an accelerated rate, and in multitudes of cases has been conducted by minds strongly affected by idealistic teaching, does not seem consistent with the supposition that there is anything in this theory which stands opposed to the pursuit of physical science.

When in his survey of man's nature and surroundings Mr. Mivart arrives at the human conception of truth, he uses language which, as we understand it, displays a highly idealistic tinge. For he appears to intimate that truth, in the highest meaning of that word, is only to be found in conformity to the supreme mind.

'Can truth be attributed to things themselves apart from and independently of all and every human mind? The answer which a man will make to this question must depend upon his conviction respecting a first cause. All those persons who are convinced of the reasonableness of Theism must affirm that truth can be so attributed. For if we may conceive what, for lack of a better name, we may call "intelligent purpose," as underlying nature, then each object in so

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII.

far as it corresponds with such intention may with justice be spoken of as true. It is another though widely different conformity between thought and things—namely, their conformity with the thought which is Divine' (p. 239).

Nor is there anything in the system of idealism which does not favour the weighty conclusion to which Mr. Mivart's investigation of nature leads him, that

'every material inorganic body and substance known to us we have, so far, reason to regard as consisting of matter together with an immaterial constituent, the latter being the active, directing, dominant principle of the material substance : *which thus consists of a material and immaterial existence, neither of which is perceptible to the senses or picturable to the imagination, though both can be conceived by the active human intellect*' (p. 415).

The chapter which Mr. Mivart entitles 'A First Cause' is altogether admirable ; and the same verdict is, in our humble judgment, to be pronounced upon the chapter 'Evolution,' which concludes the work. But when we have perused and admired the various stages of Mr. Mivart's intellectual voyage round the world, his metaphysics, sometimes doubtful, his admirable natural theology, and his varied and comprehensive collections in physical science, we ask what help he has given us upon his great subject, Truth. We must give his answer in his own words :—

'Truth is a relation between our thoughts and things external, which relation reposes on the correspondence of created things to the Intellect of their Creator, in whose image and likeness reason shows us that our own intelligence has been made, and by whose own ruling providence the whole material universe was originally created, and has since been gradually and harmoniously evolved' (p. 531).

We hardly think that the arrangement of Mr. Mivart's work corresponds to this conclusion. For if that relation of our thoughts to external things, in which truth consists, reposes upon the correspondence of created things to the intellect of their Creator, must there not be for us some method of ascent to God more direct than that long process by which Mr. Mivart leads us through created things to the revelation of His being ? If Mr. Mivart's account of the order of reason be correct, why should the relation between our thoughts and external things repose upon anything but its own inherent adaptation to our faculties ? If we must march from fundamental facts through realism, man, the world, and science to God, would it not seem that whoever gains any step in the series becomes thereby possessed of a portion of

spoken between  
nt which  
h does  
art's in-  
  
we have,  
n an im-  
dominant  
material  
the senses  
ed by the  
  
'Cause' is  
a humble  
olution,'  
ised and  
l voyage  
tful, his  
nprehen-  
p he has  
give his  
  
s external,  
ngs to the  
son shows  
e own rul-  
eated, and  
1).  
  
Mivart's  
relation of  
ts, reposes  
intellect of  
of ascent  
which Mr.  
revelation  
the order  
between our  
ng but its  
ust march  
world, and  
gains any  
portion of

truth even though he should not proceed forward to the knowledge of God? And in the large catalogue of truths which Mr. Mivart draws up how much there is which is doubtful, how much which at best is secondary, how much which many men might be ignorant of without thereby condemning themselves as ignorant of 'the truth.' But if we are to include in that term this mass of science and reflection, on what principle is it that we exclude from it the equal mass of truths, social, political, and religious, many of which are far more necessary to our guidance and meet us at a far more primary period of mental development?

But although these objections press on us so strongly that we have sometimes supposed Mr. Mivart to have forgotten his professed object of stating primary truths, and to have poured out the information of which his own mind is full without reflecting whether it was entitled to so high a name and place; yet his book is really a valuable contribution to thought. What we seem to learn from it 'on Truth' is this: that our natural relations to the world must fill an extremely large space in the field of our search for truth. The days are past when it seemed a duty for the seeker after the highest truth to turn his back upon things seen. And we must look nature in the face unbiased and free to inquire. 'Nothing external—no common consent of mankind, common sense or testimony—could ever take the place of an ultimate criterion of knowledge, since some judgment of our own mind must always decide for us with respect to the existence and value of such criteria' (p. 13). What we miss in the book is a closer connexion, and a connexion appearing at an earlier stage of thought, between religious and natural truth. Religion is among the earliest suggestions to the mind, and intermingles with the whole frame of our thought and life. It is not so placed by Mr. Mivart. And we cannot but think that his dislike to idealism and his love for physical observation have led him to found our notion of truth upon converse with the material world to a degree inconsistent with the spiritual conceptions to which he would lead us at last.

The little book of the Duke of Argyll is introduced by its accomplished author as admittedly inadequate to its great subject. But though we must allow that the mighty question which forms its title is left without a definite answer, the lecture is very instructive, and of greater value than many a ponderous treatise. The Duke extracts from Mr. G. H. Lewes the definition of Truth as 'the coinci-

dence between the external and the internal order.' But he is too clear-sighted to suppose that this definition answers the question upon his title-page without some information as to what this coincidence implies and as to the method of securing it. Now his watchword for the pursuit of truth is Analysis. He exhorts his hearers to give themselves the habit of searching into the meaning of the phrases which they use. A valuable principle; and the author illustrates his method with great effect in three instances taken from various fields of thought—the ideas of Wealth, Natural Selection, and the Supernatural.

But although 'analyse your ideas,' like 'verify your quotations,' is a valuable maxim for truth-seekers, it can hardly be said to answer the question What is Truth? For though we analyse all the ideas we possess in the carefullest manner, who is to assure us in the first place that the ideas we possess are those in which truth lies hid? We must, however, allow that the Duke's method is more adapted to the use of ordinary men than that of Mr. Mivart. We preach a more cheerful message to people of average minds employed in the business of the world if we tell them that they may be in possession of truth without going back upon the elementary relations of man to his surroundings as taught by science. And the Duke accordingly appears to teach that we may be pretty secure of inheriting from our predecessors or acquiring from the society which surrounds us the ideas in which truth is contained, just as we dig from our gardens the vegetables which are fit for our nourishment. At least if the human race and society are not in a general way possessed of truth there is very little hope that we shall succeed in an individual quest after it on our own account. But just as the vegetables must be cleaned and cooked before they are eaten, so experience shows us that we cannot expect to be put in possession of pure truth in a form adapted to our spiritual occasions direct from external sources. He advises us to take it, but with a certain suspicion and reserve, and to see that it is well cleansed and prepared before we use it.

But the author next upon our list professes to furnish us with an infallible source of pure truth upon the subjects which are vital to our welfare, and upon every subject so far as it bears upon vital truth. So that all we have to do is to look at the trade-mark and 'take no other.' To turn from the books we have been considering to that of Mr. Rivington is like going from a breezy heath into a close and very narrow

But he  
ers the  
n as to  
secur-  
uth is  
es the  
which  
strates  
n from  
Selc-

quot-  
rdly be  
ugh we  
er, who  
ess are  
ow that  
ordinary  
cheerful  
business  
session  
nd the  
pretty  
ng from  
ruth is  
ctables  
an race  
h there  
al quest  
es must  
perience  
ssion of  
s direct  
with a  
is well

urnish us  
subjects  
t so far  
do is to  
rn from  
ington  
narrow

chapel. It is, in truth, a strange destiny which has included within the same religious body two minds so different as those of Mr. Mivart and Mr. Rivington. A large system may indeed have various doors of access. But the order of ideas in these two minds is wholly different ; they differ in their general conception of the truth far more widely from each other than either of them differs from many a mind outside their common pale. And, considering the claim which the Church of Rome makes to the absolute tutelage of souls, those who find in her a perfect discipline and make themselves merry with the variations of Protestantism may well take note in this instance how hollow an external unity may be.

Mr. Mivart makes his appeal to the common standard of truth which nature supplies to all men. Not so Mr. Rivington. According to him (p. 5) 'it is in vain that Anglicans endeavour to fathom the mystery of a call into the Catholic Church.' We might therefore well use to him the words of King Padella in the *Rose and the Ring*, 'If you ride a fairy horse and wear fairy armour, what on earth is the use of my hitting you ?' But Mr. Rivington only echoes the profession of every new adherent of every sect—that he has found truth of which he knew nothing before, and that other Christians and he are on different sides of the river. Yet, with all respect, we do not believe that there is anything in the act of submission to Rome so incomprehensible to ordinary Christians. We can understand the charms of it as well as a man struggling to pay his own debts can understand the pleasure of getting somebody else to back a bill for him—a delightful thing, even though a day may be coming when our security may turn out unable to meet the liability he has undertaken for us.

It is worth while, in reference to our general subject, to analyse Mr. Rivington's claims to possess truth in a way incomprehensible to his Anglican fellow-creatures. There is not the least doubt that primary truth does run up in the last analysis into something essentially mysterious, and which cannot be conveyed from mind to mind. We cannot convey the idea of beauty nor yet the idea of right to people whose nature is unfurnished with the principles on which these ideas depend. This results from the distinction between the noumenal and the phenomenal, between pure reason and the understanding, between the unknowable and the knowable, which has a place in so many philosophies. Naturally it has a place in religion. We are not surprised when St. Paul claims a wisdom which none of the princes of this world

knew. For he is speaking of facts in which the Eternal is shown to the world, and of the first principles of the manifestation of God in the flesh. But though some infusion of the unknowable enters into all human life, and every duty to God presents itself to each man in a way of his own, and under the influence of his peculiar share of the divine gift, yet it is not proper or reasonable to call in the mysterious aspect of things upon all occasions. The phenomenal world stands upon its own basis, and duties which arise from its various circumstances must be left for their support to arguments comprehensible to the common intellect. We suspect imposture when mystery is made. For we know that the true mysterious, which has its origin in the region where our bounded life touches the eternal, is waited on by a false mysterious, the mere product of the earth, having its birth in superstition and weakness on the one side, and in the love of power or affectation of wisdom on the other. We resent the attempt to compare obedience to the Pope with obedience to God : the creature with the Creator.

Pure reason and eternal duty in their genuine form are best felt in silence and without argument, and are very ill-recommended by assumptions of mystery. For instance, obedience to parents is a divine duty commanded by God, and encouraged by the work of His creative spirit in every human heart. For this very reason we feel that a father is to blame who finds it needful to resort to arguments and claims of divine authority for his commands. They ought to be sufficiently recommended by the silent voice of conscience in the heart of the child, and by the experience of happiness which a course of obedience in the past has afforded. We feel sure that the obedience which is argued out will never be as truly connected with the divine source as that which flowed from the spontaneous operation of nature and grace concurring. The same is in our judgment the case in ecclesiastical authority. We are far from thinking meanly of the authority of the Church. On the contrary, we are not satisfied with the place in which Mr. Mivart sets her, as the secondary teacher whose lessons are to be taken up after science, the head instructor, has imparted all to which the name of truth is most properly given ; and Mr. Rivington's turbulent aggressive determination to believe all which it is least natural to believe seems to us a form of Protestantism in its most militant aspect. We hold that it is the office of the Church to exercise a parental authority, strong and gentle, recommending to her children those truths which, being most surely divine, will be

also in  
their  
Church  
in ever  
authoro  
eviden  
degree  
how a  
Pope  
claim,  
the na  
alway  
its co  
or ete

All  
missio  
to do  
of the  
from  
extens  
made  
of the  
childr  
ment  
to go  
sibilit  
mere  
of and  
determ  
to be  
referen  
tender  
'I bel  
is req  
have  
has ex  
will fa

The  
us to  
tested  
tion t  
partic  
disting  
the w  
probab

also most accordant with the wants of their nature, and with their highest reason. It is no forced imagination that the Church, represented in every diocese by a good bishop, and in every parish by a good priest, might exercise in religion an authority as truly felt, and as calmly resting upon a self-evidencing claim, as that of an earthly father. In no small degree this has been realized at various times in history. But how at this time of day can the infallible authority of the Pope ever come to fill such a place? It is an unnatural claim, which has no self-evidence, no unassailable ground in the nature of things or in history or in revelation. It must always be argued for, always be fought for, and never in all its contests can claim any true connexion with pure reason or eternal fitness.

Although Mr. Rivington claims to possess since his submission to Rome a secret incomprehensible to heretics, yet to do him justice he makes no great use of that special form of the claim which offers to the good Catholic a dispensation from the responsibility of choice and decision. But very extensive application of this notable argument has been made by others of his new persuasion. They make so much of the guarantee of certainty which the Church gives her children, that the preliminary act by which personal judgment is surrendered to her escapes notice, or is considered to go in with the rest, and to leave with them no responsibility at all. But, as Mr. Mivart has shown us, this is a mere jugglery. The decision to put our beliefs into the hands of another is as truly a personal decision of our own as any determination formed upon evidence by ourselves can claim to be. In searching for truths, as in paying our taxes, 'no reference to any third party' is accepted. We may, indeed, tender the Church's cheque by saying with the *carbonarius*, 'I believe what the Church believes.' But our endorsement is required, and if the cheque be refused, either because we have not honestly made it our own, or because the Church has exhausted her balance, it is on us that the responsibility will fall.

The search for truth is a department of morals, and puts us to trial in a like way to that in which our consciences are tested by every opportunity of right-doing and every temptation to wrong. And as in general morals so also in the particular department of truth-seeking, we must be careful to distinguish between probabilism and probability. Though the words sound similar their meanings are contrary. For probability belongs to that which on an honest view appears

most likely to be true or right ; probabilism to that for which some excuse or appearance of authority may be found by deliberately refusing to take an honest view. Probability, says Bishop Butler, is to us the guide of life ; and that both as to right and as to truth. That man has none of the eager spirit of positive right-doing who refuses to act until it can be scientifically proved that what offers itself to be done is right ; a good man ought to be bent upon always doing something positively good, but if he refuses to act on probability he will often be doing things at best indifferent, and the question of right and wrong will be in constant abeyance. In like manner a true man should desire to be living in an atmosphere of truth : but if he refuses to feed his soul with anything but actual intellectual certainties he will pass most of his life in a condition in which truth is quite at a distance. He must accept (not probabilisms but) probabilities if he is to walk in truth and to be in Him that is true.

We wish Mr. Rivington a continuance of his present bliss ; and doubtless the exaltation of a 'conversion' may be lasting, especially in those who have not been thoroughly at home in their former profession. Yet sometimes it is otherwise. Truth, as we have just learnt, is an adaptation. Truth in a particular opinion is its adaptation to the beliefs of your mind on the subject ; and truth in a system must be nothing less than the adaptation of its whole organization to your mental and spiritual habits. Hence it comes that many who have made a change for the sake of one particular principle find that they have landed themselves in a system with which they are much out of harmony. They had allowed themselves to be led by one fixed idea ; as, that they must have an infallible guide ; or, that science and the Church are at war, and they must follow science ; or, that criticism will no longer permit them to sanction current notions about the Bible ; and so they had thrown up the old profession, secure that when they had set themselves right in the one point which filled their minds they would be, like Lord John Russell, 'cocksure about everything.' But they find it far otherwise. They miss a thousand habits and associations, devotions and convictions, which had become more necessary to them than they ever knew before. And if the new opinion for which they have sacrificed so much does not lose its charm on closer acquaintance, yet it does not fill or satisfy their whole souls. There are large parts of their nature which refuse obstinately to be at ease, however diligently they are assured that they ought to have found

peace. Adaptation has not been acquired, and adaptation is truth.

There is, to be sure, the converse error, by which a satisfying system of devotion induces men to disregard proved and felt untruth in the creed which underlies the fabric. Whether of the two is the more untruthful—the man who casts away all the spiritual provision of his soul for the sake of some one doubt which after all may be ill-founded, or the man who professes what he knows to be false lest he should lose the spiritual helps to which he is accustomed? God will keep the true man from either fate.

In our special review of Mr. Rivington we have dealt with the details of his historical method. In relation to our present inquiry we shall but observe that under the influence of his divine antecedent certainty he treats the lives of the Popes in a manner undistinguishable from the figure of speech known in vulgar life as *petitio principii*. He quite forgets his profession of offering to the unenlightened Anglican an amount of reason which, though short of inspiration, is yet sufficient to show us in Rome the notes of the true Church. He renders us no reasons which have any validity except for those already persuaded. Sydney Smith complained that under the new views of early Roman history he was expected to receive Tarquin as an excellent family man. But this is nothing to the lights upon Papal Rome which the lantern of a convert is able to throw.

To our minds it would be far more satisfactory to ignore history altogether than to conduct an historical investigation under a foregone resolve that one conclusion and none other must come out. We are thankful to say that there is no corresponding obligation upon English Churchmen to force a verdict upon the history of their Church. If our kings and reformers were in error or in sin, there is no reason why we should not say so. If they did not (as we know they did not) cut off our Apostolic inheritance, it is of no primary importance to us what they thought or what they were. We find it a recommendation of a Church, as it certainly would be of an individual teacher, that it should neither smother the freedom of its members, nor interpose to prevent them from learning the true nature of its own history. But we cannot expect that in the contest of Churches things should go otherwise than in those of social life, where loud assumption imposes upon the minds which have not learned how humility and trustworthiness go together. We could not but suppose that the confidence trick by which one man is led to intrust his purse

where he sees another do so would have its imitators in things spiritual. But this does not belong to the love of truth. It is what Mr. Rivington exultingly calls it, Dependence; but if independence be the mark of a true man in daily life, why should dependence upon anyone except God be the mark of a Christian?

Of Dr. Salmon's treatise we have also given in our last number a detailed account. In that department of truth-seeking which concerns the dissipation of falsehood it is of unsurpassed excellence. Patiently, completely, with absolute fairness, and a charming humour which makes the bulky volume more interesting than many a novel, it effects the dissolution of many plausible theories of the infallibility of the Church; but as the infallibility of the Pope is the form in which the claim is made to-day, it is that which receives the most careful attention and a crushing refutation, historical, practical and moral.

No intelligent Roman Catholic could deny that the book is admirably composed, full of wit, perfectly good-tempered, wanting in no department of learning; but perhaps he might allege with some plausibility that it is too negative. There lies upon all men—even upon infidels, but much more upon religious teachers—an obligation not to treat questions concerning the foundations of truth in a purely negative manner. Therefore we often find that the most powerful controversial treatises are not the most effective in hindering perversions. The very triumph of their negation is the cause of their defeat. For adhesion to a faith is the result of a balance and a choice. Bacon puts it, 'I had rather believe all the fables of the Legend and the Talmud and the Alcoran than that this universal frame is without a mind.' And if you leave people to suppose that there is no effective theory of Church authority except the Papal, many of them will resolve rather to accept all the fables of infallibility than believe that there is no authority above individual reason. Not that Dr. Salmon does not assert positive principles. He takes his stand upon the authority of the Bible, and even ascribes authority to the Church. 'We freely confess that we need, not only the Bible, but human instruction in it' (p. 112), and we 'grant that by children and ignorant persons it is necessary that the teachers should practically be regarded as infallible' (p. 109). But what basis, it might be asked, does the book lay for such a recognition of Church authority as shall establish its claim to be regarded as practically infallible by

children, and by that still larger class, into which such multitudes would have to go if justice were done—ignorant persons? It might be further questioned whether Dr. Salmon has established the claim of the Bible to that absolute authority which he ascribes to it. True, it was not his object to do so; but an enemy is at liberty to insinuate that an impugner of the infallibility of the Bible provided with the rich resources of Dr. Salmon might conduct an assault against it upon similar lines to those which prove so effective against the infallibility of the Church. Is there nothing to be said of the variations in the statements as to Bible authority accepted in various times? nothing of the practical disregard of it by those who have professed to believe it? nothing of the abuses which in evil times it has been made to excuse? and nothing of the difficulty which is found in stating it in a form which can be permanently maintained? 'Are you sure,' the Romanist might ask, 'that if you were to deal with affirmation instead of negation, and supply the arguments, reasons, or ventures of faith which are necessary for belief in the Bible, they would not also put you on the way to belief in the Pope, in spite of the difficulties and objections to which belief in the Pope is subject?' 'Whatever the result,' Dr. Salmon will reply, 'Papal infallibility is untrue.' And untrue it is.

But however convinced a thoughtful man may be that extreme notions of Church infallibility are inimical to the genuine search after truth, it is not without emotion that he witnesses the destruction of those forms of belief which so many good Christians have found sufficient to protect their devotion and give rest to their minds. He himself may behold the process from the secure fortress of faith. But there are others who regard it with terror as the destruction of outworks which will bring the foe at last face to face with the citadel. A courageous soul will not fear the position. Sooner or later it must come, and we know no work better fitted than Dr. Salmon's to force us to the realization of the fact. We have nothing but thanks to give him for the service. It cannot but be a benefit to the cause of truth that so many specious falsehoods should be exploded. Nevertheless, we could wish that he had added to his gifts a positive exposition of the true principles of Church authority, and of the relations of the human soul to the infallible source of truth.

It seems to us hardly possible for the candid reader of the New Testament to miss the primitive doctrine upon this momentous subject. In the four gospels the sole infallible teacher shown to us is Christ. God is in Christ perfect in

holiness and perfect in wisdom. No attribute of God is separated from the rest in that Divine manifestation. It is impossible to imagine Him conveying the truth of God more than His goodness, or His goodness more than His truth. And in the acceptance of the revelation on the part of men there is the same indissoluble union. Whether for the purpose of conveyance to their brethren or for the nourishment of their own souls, they receive the gifts of Christ for mind and conscience concurrently, nor is there any failure on the one side which has not its effect on the other. He who fails in knowing Christ will fail in serving Him, and he who fails in service displays the deficiency of his knowledge. The teaching of Christ so intimately concerns practice that it would be as absurd to pretend to the knowledge of His doctrine without an effect on conduct as to speak of knowing the lessons of a master in any art without knowing something of the art.

So it is during the earthly life of the Lord. And if we believe the New Testament doctrine of the Resurrection, we must believe that His departure from men's earthly vision makes no essential change. He continues to be the teacher and the model alike of wisdom and goodness. He is the head of every man, and the general head of His body the Church. It is not according to New Testament language to speak of Him as an invisible head. He is unseen, but no more invisible than any man is invisible to those who are not in his bodily presence. The Church is not to be thought of apart from Him; He is part of her constitution, the most essential part. It is true that upon His departure from the sight of His disciples He endowed them with a special presence of His eternal Spirit. But it would be a radical mistake indeed to suppose that the Holy Ghost was given to make the Church independent of the presence of her Lord, or to endow her with a life separate from Him. The uniform doctrine of the New Testament is that the Spirit is given, not to enable men to do without the presence of Christ, but to make His presence perpetual and effective.

The life of the Church before the Resurrection and after it is in strict connexion. The one state is the development of the other. There were organization and mutual duties and mutual helps among the disciples before their Lord's death; and the same in a further stage is the case after it. They were a company while He was visibly among them. None of them had any right to interpret the personal love and interest which the Lord had for him individually as dispensing

with the help his brethren could give him, or with the use of his gifts and office for their good. Nor yet was any one permitted to lose the sense of his personal access to Christ in the feeling that he was one of a society. Precisely the same was the case after the Resurrection. The society was developed and was settled down in occupation of the conquered portion of the world and marshalled for the conquest of the rest ; but this was only the sequel to that first chapter of Christian history when Christ began both to do and to teach. And in the same proportion in which the organization of the society had advanced, the personal contact of each soul which composed it with the primary source of truth and goodness had grown more complete and more sure through the gift of the Spirit. We are but speaking obvious truisms, which lie upon the very face of the New Testament. But they are enough to show that, so long as the primitive doctrine was remembered, the attempt to represent an individual Christian life as perfect in Christ independently of the Church, or to organize the Church into a body complete without Christ as an integral part of it, was alike impossible. The argument that the Church as an earthly body requires an earthly head would have seemed in those times to condemn the man who used it as ignorant of the place and power of Jesus Christ. Nor would the elevation of the Bible as the sole source of truth to the individual soul have met with better acceptance.

Do we find Christians in those times believing in the infallibility of the Church? Certainly, if Christ be included in the Church. And they do ever include Him. The teachers and rulers of the Church under Him possess authority, but never without appeal to Him. Submission to Him requires and implies due submission to His subordinates, and the appeal from them to Him is made at the appellant's peril. A frivolous and vexatious recourse to His authority as against theirs is an offence to Him, and brings a severe condemnation. But this recourse is always open in the last resort even to the very lowest of His subjects against the very highest. We see this system at work in all its parts in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles. And we may illustrate it by that degraded and materialised image of it which the Papal doctrine affords.

It is manifest, as Dr. Salmon abundantly proves, that Papal infallibility considered as a means of guidance for individual members of the Roman Church is little better than a delusion. They have no personal access to it. In multitudes of cases it fails to give any response, even where it is

most wanted. And, indeed, the conditions on which it works are so difficult to ascertain that those who imagine they have obtained its guidance will constantly find that they are deceived. Nevertheless, the mere imagination that Papal infallibility exists imparts a sense of security to the minds of those who can accept it. In the first place, it gives them a consciousness that whatever mistake their parish priest or their bishop or a council of bishops may make, there lies an appeal, of which in an extreme case they might avail themselves, to a tribunal which cannot err. But, in the next place, what is more important still, the actual infallibility at the head of affairs lends a quasi-infallibility to all the inferior authorities so long as they are the recognized agents of the master. The fiction that the king can do no wrong gives a sacred sanction to all the processes of state: a wholesome result in temporal government, for there order is the chief object. But when it is carried into the kingdom of truth it is difficult to imagine anything more dangerous. What could there be more fatal to any appropriation of truth by the soul than that it should imagine itself in communication with a source of guidance which in reality it never touches, and that it should subject its duty of personal inquiry to authorities which can in no sense guarantee their own correctness?

When we compare the primitive doctrine of the infallibility of the Church with this we see that all that is fictitious and deceptive in the one becomes genuine and real in the other. The connexion between the individual soul and the source of infallible guidance is in the primitive gospel no distant imagination impossible to effectuate, but an absolute and ever-present fact undeniable by any believer. For it is a connexion with the source of its being, with the head of its race, with its pattern and Saviour. The infallible guidance is perfect in its source and in its adaptation to the special wants of the individual life. The use which is made of it fails of infallible perfection only because of the failures of human will to receive what is given. So far as these failures are the fault of the individual the Infallible Authority is able to recognize and punish them; so far as they are the result of circumstances or the sins of other men the same authority is able to make an accurately just allowance for them. And every genuine and faithful effort after truth He is able to reward with increased knowledge, exactly in proportion to the degree of desert. An appeal to the Pope from the decision of an inferior judge is an expedient so cumbrous, so slow, so disappointing that even in questions of temporal law it is a byword among human tri-

bunals ; but in the greater matters of conscience and of truth there is not one case on record in which it has proved itself able to give rest to a disturbed soul. Whereas the appeal to Christ is direct and immediate, and His unseen spiritual decisions have in countless instances given reproof or vindication where no lower authority could minister justice.

When the head of the Church is considered as the support of the deputed authority of his officers we equally find the headship of Christ to be infinitely superior in efficiency to that of the Pope. The Pope's delegation is a distant and unreal affair for the flock among whom the ministry of his servants is to be exercised. It is heard of, but not felt to be in any way present. Whereas Christ's authority to His ministers is a grace both given and exercised in the midst of the Church and on the spot. It is not an authority which must be fetched from a distant country and which remains as the remembrance of a past gift. But He who gave the gift is ever present to watch over its exercise and to support its authority. Nor is it only the official teachers of the Church who can claim a hearing in the Name of Christ. But whoever in the whole body has any truth to impart may call upon men to listen to him in the Name of Him who is true ; everyone that was of the truth heard His voice when He spoke on earth, and none who will not listen to truth from whatsoever quarter can boast to belong to Him.

This is the system of infallible guidance as seen in Christian history before there was a Pope, and before there was a Bible. For, although we use the New Testament as the historical record of this early condition and as in itself an element of vast importance in the Lord's rule of His Church, we do not set it in that position which Protestantism has claimed for it as the proper antagonist of Papal infallibility and the guide which can alone supply what the Pope supplies in the Roman system. *That place belongs to Christ.* It will seem no doubt to Mr. Rivington that the headship of the unseen Saviour is vague and unpractical considered as a security for truth. To us the contrary seems the case. It is the Pope whose guidance is vague and unreal—ever making claims but never giving efficient direction. It is not the inefficiency of the headship of Christ which has persuaded so many that He needs an earthly vicar, but that want of faith in things unseen, that preference for what is visible and palpable which is natural to men. This preference is recognized by Christianity as worthy of a certain indulgence, for the Incarnation descends to it. But it is ever running into excesses and using

the helps which were given for realizing things spiritual as substitutes for them.

The growth of the Papacy closely resembles the demand of the Israelites for an earthly ruler. God describes it (1 Sam. viii. 7) as the rejection of Him from being king over them. And yet it does not provoke Him to cast them off. His own divine headship is not absolutely lost to them, even though they have set an earthly ruler too high. The Lord will not forsake His people for His great Name's sake. And we believe, as in truth as well as in charity we are bound to do, that all the exaggerations of Papal claims are too weak to exclude the grace and power of the true and living Head of the Church from saving contact with millions in the Roman Communion.

As for our own Church we are far indeed from boasting the efficiency with which the Catholic idea is carried into practice amongst us. It is the method of Rome to seek proselytes by the profession of absolute perfection : a method which prepares sure disappointment for the most truthful of her converts, and which we should diligently shun. But when all is said that can justly be said of the insufficient discipline under which the Anglican forces are arrayed against the enemies of truth, we hold that laymen of the Church of England are better provided for guidance into truth than the members of any other communion. They are not asked to shut their eyes to the progress of scientific knowledge ; nor, on the other hand, is their faith liable to change at the bidding of popular feeling sanctioned by an authority which rules popular feeling by the demagogue's device of adopting its preferences. Therefore when our Roman friends warn us of the insecurity of our position and boast the certainty which they offer, we will ask them to remember what happened to those who found a certain harbour not commodious to winter in, and followed the advice to depart thence also. They supposed for the time that they had obtained their purpose, but had good reason afterwards to be sorry that they had not accepted the Apostolic counsel to remain in the roadstead, where, if not wholly free from danger, they were, with due watchfulness, sheltered and safe.

The Essays of Mr. Aubrey Moore will be to many of us no new acquaintance. They reproduce a series of articles which since an early period of the Evolution movement have adorned the pages of the *Guardian*, and attracted wide admiration for their independence and solidity of thought. Mr. Moore does

not merely put up with Evolution as an unwelcome discovery to which we must grudgingly surrender some of our old notions though we had rather it had never been heard of. He does not, in the course of the readjustment, withdraw any portion of the truth which the Church has always held. He is an enthusiastic Catholic and an enthusiastic Evolutionist. He believes that a timid and attenuated Christianity, scarcely to be distinguished from Deism, is not the form of religion best adapted to survive in the contests of the day, but on the contrary that the Catholic faith in its entirety is fitted, not merely to hold its own, but to answer many urgent questions which no other existing authority can reply to. It is his contention that Evolution is not alone reconcilable with the faith, but has actually rendered impossible the forms of unbelief which for centuries past have been the faith's most formidable enemies, both by their external assaults and by their subtle internal influence.

It is not at all difficult to understand Mr. Moore's reason for this opinion. The theory of Evolution presents to us the whole universe as bound together in a mighty system. It is a system adapted to the comprehension of our intellect, and which we inevitably think of as a plan. Strive as we may to regard the mighty progress as ruled by chance, we are unable to do so. A sequence in which every step has its reason and its use is too like the work of our own minds to be thought of as unintelligent. The philosophy which is indeed materialistic is that of atomism, which regards phenomena as unconnected, appearing and disappearing by no causation that is comprehensible to us: but under the belief of Evolution this method (if method it can be called) disappears for ever. Therefore Mr. Moore views with jealousy any attempt to show a break in the chain of Evolution, even though it be made in the interests of religion. He considers, in his review of Professor Drummond, the principle of biogenesis as a foundation far too insecure for our religious philosophy, and believes that if ever it should be shown that life is evolved from lifeless matter, the effect would merely be to add a further mark of wonder to the power of God who framed and rules the mighty scheme. He regards the Duke of Argyll as but a weak-kneed Evolutionist, and we suppose he would view with comparatively slight sympathy the striking example which, in the little work now under review, the Duke gives of an apparatus deliberately prepared in nature for a future use which is in no degree attained by the earlier stages of the operation. We allude to the discoveries of Pro-

fessor Ewart, which appear to show in the anatomy of the skate and the ray the preparations for the electrical machinery which appears complete in the torpedo, and is in the latter creature highly useful for protection, while neither of the former has the slightest power of the kind.

If we understand Mr. Moore rightly, he would see such appearances disproved without a sigh, and would prefer to discover the pressure of use and function under which the organs grew through all their stages. He would view without dismay the whole domain of matter in all its changes as filled by a linked order and sequence. But he does not regard this as the whole account of things. He is well aware, as his review of Bishop Temple shows, that belief in the framer of a protoplasm containing the power of all future change might be as deistical a faith as that in Paley's Divine watchmaker. The belief of the true Evolutionist is that the divine thought inspires every successive movement as well as the original commencement. The immanence and intelligence and personality of the motive power in nature are the genuine lessons of Evolution. Mr. Mivart, indeed, regards the theory of an unconscious intelligence as an actual contradiction: but the notion has commended itself to many, who, instead of viewing our conscious intellect as the crown of Evolution towards which all its lower stages have been guided, regard it, on the contrary, as an exception and even a defect in the vast system of impulse by which nature pursues her ends but knows not why. And even if the philosophy of the Unconscious be rejected, it would still remain possible to regard the intellect in nature as impersonal. We must be clear, then, that the human intellect, with all its powers of consciousness, is the deliberate and legitimate product of the power which rules throughout nature, and that the human will in all its mysterious spontaneity is equally real and equally the gift of the supreme source of life. The power which endows us with consciousness and personality must be itself conscious and personal. And when we have reached thus far we are well prepared to learn that God has spoken in revelation to the reason and has inspired the will of the creature in which His own nature is imaged, and the development of the Catholic Church opens upon our view; a series as wonderful and as awful as that of nature, in which there is not only beauty and order but also deformity and destruction. Progress is made by opposition and by struggle, yet still it is made, and although there is need of patience yet the foundation of God standeth sure.

Mr. Moore's Essays do not, even in their united form,

furni  
them  
which  
tions  
natu  
gant  
reflec  
offic

AR

1. Fa
2. Jo
3. TH

THE o  
to per  
mainly  
by suc  
his ow  
princip  
only t  
comple  
by ca  
mind  
sion o  
or insc  
to the  
by the  
of suc  
conditi  
ing a  
skill d  
pulatio  
with it  
in the  
concer

furnish us with a complete philosophy : nor is the portion of them which treats of the Faith so largely developed as that which treats of Science. But we discern in them the foundations of a synthesis of truth more religious than Mr. Mivart's naturalism, and more natural than Mr. Rivington's extravagant ecclesiasticism. In this, we would fain hope, Mr. Moore reflects the spirit and temper of his Church, and the high office of reconciliation to which she is called.

---

#### ART. V.—THREE CONTROVERSIAL NOVELS.

1. *Faithful and Unfaithful.* By MARGARET LEE, author of *Doctor Wilmer's Love, Lizzie Adriance, &c.* (London : 1889.)
2. *John Ward, Preacher.* By MARGARET DELAND, author of *The Old Garden.* Eighth Edition. (London : 1889.)
3. *The Story of an African Farm.* A Romance by RALPH IRON (OLIVE SCHREINER). New Edition. (London : 1889.)

THE critic of modern fiction has a task of no slight difficulty to perform. It was formerly his business to regard a novel, mainly, if not exclusively, as a work of art, and to judge it by such application of well-established canons of criticism as his own literary insight and ability could work out. The principal elements of genuine artistic success—second only to fidelity to truth—were acknowledged to be unity and completeness ; and these, it was held, could only be attained by careful rejection of everything superfluous. That the mind of the reader should be distracted neither by the intrusion of unnecessary matter nor by the discussion of intricate or insoluble problems, which it was impossible to subordinate to the general scope of the story, was a law enforced alike by the dictates of common sense and by the uniform examples of such romances as have secured lasting fame. Under such conditions the chief points for critical examination in reviewing a novel were the inherent probability of the story, the skill displayed in the elaboration of the plot and the manipulation of its details, and the insight into human nature, with its manifold play of varied light and shade, exhibited in the behaviour of the persons with whom the fiction was concerned. So generally were these principles allowed that

argumentative and propagandist novels were long deemed to be a violation of literary law. They involved the introduction of an element entirely alien to the true ideal of imaginative composition. Truth to nature observed during the development of the story would, it was considered, teach with sufficient clearness such moral or religious lessons as spontaneously flowed from it, and all others were out of place. What could not be enforced without recourse to didactic essays and elaborate argument was left to the more serious and massive treatment of philosophers and divines.

Contemporary fiction presents, however, a remarkable change from this earlier estimate of its appropriate method and arena, and an increasing class of writers avowedly employ fiction as a mere vehicle for the conveyance of their opinions. To this class belongs each of the three works before us. They are alike in their *raison d'être*, and in the fact that each is by a female hand ; but they differ *toto caelo* in other particulars. So wide is the interval between Mrs. Lee and Olive Schreiner that their books might serve generally as typical examples of what 'a novel with a purpose' ought and ought not to be. The former is simple, concentrated, reserved ; the latter is pretentious, discursive, arrogant. In *Faithful and Unfaithful*, duty is the test by which the worth of life is tried. In *An African Farm*, impulse is the warrant for action, and the immature judgment of youth the tribunal for determining the truth of God. The three works taken together form a graduated scale in which *John Ward* holds the middle place. *Faithful and Unfaithful* is devoted to the illustration of a single topic—the misery which may result from the facility of divorce legalised in certain districts of the United States. *John Ward*, under the veil of fiction, denounces directly Calvinism and the doctrine of eternal punishment, and by implication a good deal more. But the crudest example of the argumentative romance is supplied by the *Story of an African Farm*. Here the tale is a mere peg whereon to hang prolix dissertations in which religion, providence, prayer, marriage, rights of women, education, and so forth are treated from the stand-point of pessimistic atheism. All three works have attained considerable notoriety. The first has been honoured by a laudatory notice from the pen of Mr. Gladstone. The last, we regret to learn, has attained a very considerable circulation : due partly to the strange fascination which sceptical novels seem to possess for a certain class of readers, and partly to the fact that several literary journals of high standing have spoken of it in terms of com-

mendation which we deem calculated—unintentionally, no doubt—very seriously to mislead.

It would not be easy to imagine a better example of a true, pure-minded woman than that which is presented by Constance Travers, the heroine of *Faithful and Unfaithful*. Mrs. Lee mixes her palate with sober colours, and her picture has rather a sombre tone; but any deficiency in brilliancy is abundantly compensated by careful finish and fidelity to truth. The story is extremely simple in construction. The scene lies exclusively among a wealthy circle of New York merchant families. Constance has married Gilbert Travers, a man every way unworthy of her. He is clever, showy, extravagant, speculative, and unscrupulous: not without certain good impulses, and at times really mastered by genuine admiration for his wife's self-denying love and high principle; but perpetually chafed by a conscientiousness which jars unpleasantly upon his own laxity in social life and in mercantile gambling. Constance has been brought up under the somewhat distracting guidance of a father who gradually amasses wealth through the steadfast pursuance of right ends by right means, and a mother who deteriorates, as their fortune increases, from a strong, healthy woman engrossed in domestic cares, to a frivolous worldly woman of fashion; but the young girl has been sheltered from acquaintance with evil and is utterly unsuspicuous of the darker side of modern society. A second couple, the Whitings, whose marriage has been purely *de convenance*—the husband immensely rich and intensely vulgar; the wife proud of her beauty and personal accomplishments, and disgusted with the coarseness of the man to whom she is bound—play a part in the story only second to that filled by Constance and Gilbert Travers. The English reader will be shocked, as the plot is gradually unfolded, to learn on what superficial grounds divorce is tolerated in the American commonwealth, and that not only is Maude Whiting's marriage dissolved on the plea of incompatibility of temper, but Gilbert is permitted through mere absence—craftily planned by himself—for a twelvemonth, to divorce the faithful wife whose property he has squandered, and who is the mother of his three young children.

Such a subject goes down to the very foundation of society, and of law natural and divine, and Mrs. Lee's manner of handling it is completely worthy of its sanctity and importance. Had the too prevalent readiness to pander to a low tone of morality in any degree tainted her mind she would have found it easy enough to give a very different bias to her

story. The early age at which Constance was married, her complete ignorance of Gilbert's real character, the mortification caused by her gradual awakening to the true nature of the man in whom she had believed so implicitly, to whom she had clung so loyally, and for whom she had sacrificed everything so unreservedly, his heartless cruelty in squandering her fortune, his neglect of her and their children—all these points might have been urged in justification of her own voluntary separation from one who was so utterly worthless. At times we are even conscious of a certain irritation at the meekness with which Constance submits, at Gilbert's bidding, to associate with persons whom her refined and high-toned nature would have gladly avoided, or to surrender first one and then another item of property until everything was sacrificed ; but even when we question her judgment, we cannot fail to admit the validity of the reasons on which it is based. Mrs. Lee's strength lies in the clear-headed consistency with which she follows Christian teaching to its legitimate conclusions, without allowing her mind to be warped by the specious fallacies that have such deadly power to pervert the judgment. However mournful the trials in which Constance finds herself involved, however unreasonable the sacrifices which she endures, however bitter the injustice to which she is subjected, it is not owing to womanly, even though excusable, weakness that she submits. Her conduct is guided by well-defined maxims, whose meaning she has firmly grasped, and whose direction she is determined to obey. Her decisions are often only reached after a struggle which told seriously upon her health and spirits, and which is powerfully pourtrayed.

'She was troubled about several things, all important to her, although seeming very trivial when Gilbert riddled them with his arguments. But she could not regard them as he did. Her religious education had imposed upon her the duty of self-examination. Her duty to God, to her husband and her family, was a subject of regular thought, and her earnest endeavours to perform it made up her life. So far it had not occurred to her that she had a duty to herself, but she was often of late impressed with the conviction that her duty to God was not performed as it had been before her marriage. What Gilbert exacted as her duty to him did not accord with her old ideas of truth and honesty in the sight of God, and she often prayed to God with her whole heart, and felt that she was not deserving of the blessing she desired. The effort to act conscientiously herself, and to have faith in her husband's honesty of mind and purpose, was wearing her out. She was bewildered by the vast difference between theory and practice, and at a loss to reconcile the co-existence in one

individual of a perfect theory and a false practice. It was a problem that was beyond her' (pp. 52, 53).

The mental conflict is perpetually renewed, and the pathos of the book consists in the gradual and painful disillusion of Constance, whose loving self-depreciation is ever ready to attribute to herself the blame for Gilbert's unkindness, and in her fruitless efforts to make him see things from her own standpoint of truth and honour. 'To sit with and listen to people for whom she did not care; to learn a number of gossipy stories about people whom she had never seen; and to see Gilbert spending money on strangers, while his honest debts remained unpaid and forgotten,—it was all false and humiliating, but how to help it.' The powerlessness of a woman to be happy if her husband chooses to make her miserable is but gradually realized, and the determination to bend her will to his (to the utmost point which conscience will allow) is accepted as a part of the cross which she has to bear. With Constance the difficulty or pain involved in the performance of duty is never allowed to turn her aside from its narrow and rugged path.

The influence of such an example could not fail to tell upon those with whom Constance is brought into contact, and its effect upon Maude Whiting and her sister Cora is described with all the vividness of true insight into woman's nature, and of true estimate of the power of goodness.

'Mrs. Whiting sighed, and began moving some books on the table. "If one could shut one's eyes to the responsibilities of life, it would be worth living," she said quietly but firmly.

"I thought that accepting them and trying to do our best with them was what made life worth living," Constance said, glancing up from the baby's face to its mother's.

"How old are you?"

"Eighteen."

"You still go to church?"

"Why, yes."

Mrs. Whiting laughed mockingly. "You are still at the theorizing age. Wait, my dear, until the responsibilities are upon you and you have to reduce your theories to practice. I had lovely theories of life when I was eighteen. Oh my God!"

She turned to the window, and Constance followed her.

"Oh, Mrs. Whiting, what did I say?—I didn't mean!"

"Oh you did nothing—you said nothing—but you looked so sweet, so innocent sitting there—you brought back the past. You see I never was as beautiful as you are—but I was once eighteen. I had visions—" She began to sob. . . .

She drew Constance into the next room, and they stood to-

gether in the wide window ; one woman crying, the other ready to cry in sympathy for the grief that she could not understand' (p. 37).

The keynote struck thus early in the story is never lowered in pitch to its conclusion. Persistence in uprightness and honour is not gilded with any false attractions, nor is the writer's consistent advocacy of the sanctity of marriage weakened by her inability to comprehend the arguments in favour of relaxing their stringency. The effect which facility of divorce produces in enervating the moral fibre of society is brought out far more powerfully by Mrs. Lee's method of portrayal than if she had conceived either Maude Whiting or Gilbert Travers as intentionally criminal from the outset. They are simply average specimens of self-indulgent men and women, drawn to one another by a similarity of tastes, and by the subtle influence of a common laxity of principle which at once attracts and repels. Through their earlier intercourse no thought of the eventual *dénouement* ever crosses the mind of either, and each of them frankly despises the character of the other in comparison with the pure, high-souled woman who is to become the victim of their crime. But at the very point where Maude Whiting needs to be braced to the performance of sacred but uncongenial duties, her strength is undermined by the existence of the law which permits divorce and of the public opinion which countenances it. Her husband is odiously vulgar and addicted to low society, where he is often betrayed into excess. The yoke of marriage with such a man galls her terribly. She has the power and the desire to shine in society. She ought not, so she reasons, to be made miserable for life through one slight mistake at an early age. She will get free, and show by her example that a clever woman can be sufficient for herself, and hold her own in the world.

When circumstances so trying arise—and we do not for one moment deny the severity of the trial which they involve—it is well to turn to general principles, and to consider the consequences of the universal adoption of the remedy which may be advocated for a case of special hardship. If our purpose be to lessen human suffering we must beware lest the cure should prove worse than the disease, and by its indirect action aggravate the trouble it was designed to assuage. On so deep a question it may be well to quote the language of so powerful a judge as Lord Stowell.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Judgment of Lord Stowell in *Evans v. Evans*, 1 Hagg. Cons. Rep. 36, 37. See, too, an admirable 'deliverance' on 'The Question of Divorce' by Mr. Gladstone in the current number of the *North American Review*,

'I  
marri  
stand  
know  
that  
husba  
and w  
which  
marri  
pass t  
comm  
been  
state o  
of the

H  
being  
Cora,  
prete  
fain  
admin  
of the  
fully  
taking  
think  
friend

“  
his ful  
“I can  
in trou  
Good  
The se

‘C  
breath  
Oh, I  
have b  
for you  
explain  
upon a  
on to t  
I—I fa  
pander  
no pow  
handsom  
that, an  
the hor

and a  
number

'It must be carefully remembered that the general happiness of married life is secured by its indissolubility. When people understand that they *must* live together, except for a very few reasons known to the law, they learn to soften, by mutual accommodation, that yoke which they know they cannot shake off ; become good husbands and good wives from the necessity of remaining husbands and wives ; for necessity is a powerful master in teaching the duties which it imposes. If it were once understood that upon mutual disgust married persons might be legally separated, many couples who now pass through the world with mutual comfort, with attention to their common offspring and to the moral order of civil society, might have been at this moment living in a state of mutual unkindness—in a state of estrangement from their common offspring—and in a state of the most licentious and unreserved immorality.'

How unconscious Gilbert is of the vortex into which he is being drawn is effectively brought out in an interview with Cora, whose clear, strong sense pierces grandly through the pretexts with which Travers has deceived himself and would fain blind the eyes of others. His self-esteem, his genuine admiration for the wife he is wronging, and the ultimate result of the false position which Gilbert persists in filling, are powerfully pourtrayed. Cora, with womanly straightforwardness, is taking Gilbert to task for visiting her sister. You should think of your wife, she urges, before you think of your friends :—

"I never wronged my wife!" said Gilbert, drawing himself up to his full height, and meeting Cora's fearless eyes with a steady glance. "I can feel compassion for a hundred women, and try to serve them in trouble with assistance or advice, if they ask for it—but my wife ! Good God ! do you suppose I think of her in connexion with them ?" The scorn and sneer were equal in voice and look.

Cora flushed painfully, her eyes fell, she clasped her hands, breathing hard. Then she faced him, speaking forcibly : "I see ! Oh, I wish Maude could have seen and heard you then ! It would have been a revelation to her, a revelation ! You can feel as you do for your wife, you can recognize in her the purity that you cannot explain, and yet you can leave her—yes, leave her, to flatter and fawn upon another woman—whom in your heart you despise—and lead her on to the very actions that are destroying her morally. Oh, Mr. Travers, I—I fail to see that you have ever been my sister's friend ! But you pander to her follies, and she flatters your vanity ! She can do what no power can make your wife do ! She can sit up and tell you how handsome you are ! how beautifully you sing ! how well you do this, that, and the other ! and you think she appreciates you more than the honest girl who loves you so devotedly that she cannot put her

and a Paper by Mr. Phelps on Divorce in America, in the December number of *The Forum*.

thoughts into words ! And you and Maude are to go on with this sham friendship, and Constance is to do the suffering ! Oh what selfish beings men are ! Defend me from the whole sex ! " (p. 143)

We cannot follow in detail the gradual development of Gilbert's downward course. The alternating seasons of folly and repentance, the irritation and unrest engendered by commercial gambling, the sacrifice of Constance's property, swallowed up in senseless speculation, the alienation of her friends from her husband, and the final crash when she finds herself without appeal—as she has been without shadow of blame—cut off by the husband who has ruined her—these are elements which in Mrs. Lee's skilful hands compose a deeply pathetic story. True to herself, Constance declines to eat the bread of idleness or to live on the help which her own family proffer her. She had already begun to maintain herself and her children by opening a school before the divorce, and she perseveres despite the sorrow which is crushing her.

'The peace of God which passeth all understanding' is not 'a figure of speech nor an imaginary reward of certain exalted conditions of the mind. It is as real as doubt, pain, grief, joy, or bliss. It makes labour possible, trouble tolerable, rest sweet.' Constance seeks it in the path of self-sacrificing love. She determines that her own wrongs shall not destroy her children's rights. Their childhood shall not be darkened because of their father's sin. Her life is hard, her burden heavy, but she has 'the peace of God.'

On passing from *Faithful and Unfaithful* to *John Ward* we at once become conscious of the difficulty we described in our opening paragraph. Regarded exclusively as a work of art, *John Ward* evinces considerable creative ability. The characters are skilfully and firmly drawn; the by-play of those who fill the subordinate parts is well sustained; the stage is well filled without being overcrowded, and the story seldom flags, for lack of incident or interest, to its close. If there is but little evidence of the dramatic power which enables a writer to depict the play of those varying and contradictory motives which make human life so complex a problem, there is a distinct individuality in each of the dozen or more of persons with whom the story has to do, and a vein of humour which helps to relieve the monotony inseparable perhaps from the delineation of commonplace existence in an American country town. No one expects thrilling excitement in the annals of a 'sweet trans-Atlantic village,' yet beneath the smooth surface of its outward calm, sin and sorrow,

with this  
h what  
p. 143)  
ent of  
of folly  
y com-  
, swal-  
friends  
herself  
ame—  
lements  
athetic  
bread  
proffer  
nd her  
nd she

ing' is  
certain  
t, pain,  
e toler-  
f self-  
rs shall  
all not  
ard, her

*Ward*  
ibed in  
work of  
The  
play of  
d ; the  
the story  
se. If  
which  
and con-  
plex a  
e dozen  
l a vein  
parable  
ce in an  
tment  
beneath  
sorrow,

human passion and divine discipline, are ever teaching lessons—for those who have eyes to see and genius to describe them—well worthy of the profoundest study. It is within the power of a cultivated fancy to unite in one organic whole thoughtful speculation on deep questions with a narrative of the simplest lives. With *John Ward*, so regarded, and exclusive of its direct and implied religious teaching, we should be abundantly content.

We are persuaded that Mrs. Deland would be entirely dissatisfied with a verdict confined to this aspect of her work. *John Ward, Preacher*, is written with the purpose indicated by the motto on its title-page :—

‘I sent my soul through the invisible,  
Some letter of that after-life to spell :  
And by and by my soul returned to me,  
And answered, “ I myself am Heav’n and Hell.”’

This purpose forms the kernel of the story, a very brief outline of which will serve to make its drift and our own comments intelligible to our readers.

John Ward, minister of a Calvinistic congregation at Lochhaven, has married Helen Jeffery, the niece of Dr. Howe, rector of Ashurst. Ward, with his deacons and his flock, holds the doctrines of Jonathan Edwards, with all their repulsive crudeness of expression, in the highest honour. Helen regards them with the deepest abhorrence. The chief interest of the book is centred round the struggle which John Ward wages with himself, in veiling at first, through his love for Helen, the terrible dogma to which he hopes gradually to win her; in his growing conviction in which he is at once confirmed and almost maddened by the blunt remonstrances of his deacons—that he is faithless alike to her and to his charge in not insisting upon the doctrines of damnation; in the hopeless divergence of husband and wife on this topic, whilst their hearts are still bound together with the tenderest mutual affection; and in Ward’s final decision to separate from the wife he loves to distraction until, under Divine guidance, she has learned to accept what he deems exclusive truth—a separation which proves to be more than heart and brain can endure, and leaves his widow to find in a life of active benevolence her only refuge from mental perplexity and crushing sorrow. So mournful a theme is relieved by cursory details of a brighter hue. The irritation of the easy-going rector at being troubled with deep questions that disturb his peace, the love story of his sweet daughter Lois and her suitors, the

humorous perplexity of Mr. Denner as to which of the two maiden sisters he shall ask to marry him, a perplexity which remains unsolved to his death, the rough coarse life of Lochhaven in contrast with the stagnant, refined quietude of Ashurst, are all well sketched in ; but we must pass them all by in order to concentrate our attention upon the *motif* of the story.

At the outset we must utter our protest against the incongruous intermixture of things secular and sacred which *John Ward* presents. We entirely acquit Mrs. Deland of intentional irreverence. We sympathize with her repulsion from the teaching of Jonathan Edwards. We can imagine how such a caricature of Christianity as is presented by Elder Dean or Mrs. Grier would shock any cultured mind. We recall Pascal's vindication of his exposure of Jesuit casuistry, that in pouring contempt upon it he was not ridiculing sacred things. But the matters which Mrs. Deland selects to handle involve deep mysteries of God's foreknowledge and man's eternal destiny, and here is that which jars painfully in their intrusion amidst the fanciful murmuring of a feeble valetudinarian, the comic irresolution of a senile lawyer, or even the pure love-dreams of a gentle girl.

Nor is the authoress happier in her mode of treating such profound enigmas than she is in the setting with which she surrounds them. From that Sacred Word which Helen Ward rejects she might have learned, in simpler, clearer language, the truth paraded on her title. That the kingdom of God is within us is a truth which has its place according to the analogy of faith, but which may easily be perverted into a practical falsehood if wrenched from its due subordination to the entire faith once for all delivered to us. Any such qualification of partial truth is utterly ignored, not only by ignorant fanatics like Elder Dean, but by John and Helen Ward. One would suppose—so far as the teaching of this story enlightens us—that there was no alternative between acceptance of the crudest theory of verbal inspiration and the absolute rejection of the whole Bible ; no warning in Holy Scripture to distinguish between the letter and the spirit ; no gradual development of revelation to mankind as it became able to bear it ; no historic chain of evidence by which the written word can be traced through eighteen centuries ; no living witness and authority in the Catholic Church. That Helen Ward, who acknowledged no standard by which to determine truth, save that of her own inner consciousness, should make shipwreck of her faith is natural, although sad enough. But why should

Mr.  
and  
ness  
tend  
allo  
in h  
in t  
obvi  
pers  
man  
far  
the  
pati  
and  
boo  
ther  
com  
abo  
sam  
eter  
has  
No  
prov  
mar  
far  
sava  
say  
  
pain  
sorr  
poss  
reve  
dise  
Two  
the  
prop  
ever  
gent  
petit  
the  
belie  
An  
piet

Mr. Denner, who holds Christianity in the highest respect, and his lifelong friend, the orthodox rector, be in utter darkness about the world to come? If Mrs. Deland merely intends us to understand that there are nominal Churchmen who allow life to slip by without serious thought on what Denner in his last moments says so pathetically 'seems the one thing in the world worth being sure of,' she is only stating an obvious, though terrible fact. Nor would any thoughtful person expect helpful guidance in a dying hour from such a man as Dr. Howe. But is not the reader intended to draw a far wider conclusion? Or, if not, what is the conviction which the writer designs to impart? We confess that a sense of impatience stirs us when nibblers at revelation alternately applaud and undermine its teaching. 'Ah, doctor! it is a wonderful book! How it does know the heart! The soul sees itself there,' says Mr. Denner. But he has lived, and he dies, in complete ignorance of all that the 'wonderful book' teaches about the life beyond. 'Where shall I be?' he asks in the same interview (p. 336), 'Knowing—or perhaps fallen on an eternal sleep.' No hint is conveyed to the reader that Christ has brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel. No allusion is made to that promise of eternal life which has proved effectual to sustain the heart under the agonies of martyrdom and the long-drawn suffering of a life of trial. So far as any actor in the drama here presented is concerned, save the high-souled Calvinistic minister, it is a delusion to say there is 'laid up a crown of glory,' or to speak of 'tasting the powers of the world to come.'

The *Story of an African Farm* is one of the most intensely painful books we ever read: not that the writer melts us to sorrow by her powers of pathetic description—although she possesses these in no ordinary degree—but because of the revelation the work affords of a mind that seems hopelessly diseased. The structure of the tale is simple to baldness. Two young English girls, cousins, are living at the farm under the care of a Boer woman, Tant' Sannie, widow of its English proprietor and stepmother of Em, to whom the farm is eventually to belong. Em is plain in feature, simple-minded, gentle, and affectionate. Her cousin Lyndall, the heroine, is *petite*, beautiful, haughty, and passionate, gifted or cursed with the sceptic temperament which can take nothing on trust, nor believe anything except the infallibility of its own conclusions. An elderly German manager, a man of sterling, old-fashioned piety, and his son Waldo, a ragged shepherd-lad, complete

the home circle until the intrusion of Bonaparte Blenkins, a highly-exaggerated scoundrel of the Jingle type, into their midst. No other names occur in the first part of the story. In its second portion a certain well-bred and well-read Englishman, young, dissolute, and clever, twice over—for we presume he is the same person—bursts upon the stage, and as suddenly disappears, on one occasion, as the lover, the seducer, and the would-be husband of Lyndall; on another, as a passing traveller who, *à propos* of some rude carving which Waldo designs for his father's grave, delivers himself of an elaborate and mysterious allegory of the difficulty and hopelessness of the search for truth. He then places in Waldo's hands a nameless old brown volume and departs, leaving the reader, as in Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*,

‘ . . . like one that hath been stunned,  
And is of sense forlorn.’

Later on there is introduced a feeble-minded youth, Gregory Rose. This worthy, after becoming engaged to Em, who is worlds too good for him, conceives a violent passion for Lyndall, and, despite her scarce-concealed contempt, develops a tenacity of purpose and a sublimity of self-sacrifice which even the ennobling power of an absorbing affection could hardly engender in so weak a character. Forecasting the trouble which will befall Lyndall, he tracks her flight, visits in female disguise the inn where she lies sick, and nurses her with the tenderest solicitude until her death, when he returns to the farm, and after a brief interval marries Em. Waldo, the record of whose wanderings fills a wearisome chapter, also comes back to the farm, and, hearing that Lyndall is dead, himself pines away and dies. Each part of the story is headed by a legend indicative of its purpose. The first—a quotation from De Tocqueville—is an expansion of Wordsworth's line ‘The child is father of the man.’ The second is, we presume, a condensed form of the pessimist creed, and runs as follows: ‘And it was all play, and no one could tell what it had lived and worked for. A striving, and a striving, and an ending in nothing.’

But a rapid outline of the story conveys a very imperfect conception of the style and structure of the book, which might serve to illustrate the exact reverse of Goethe's maxim—‘Tell me your convictions; keep your doubts to yourself, I have plenty of my own.’ Whole pages of the *Freethinker* might have been exhausted for the difficulties which are here crowded into the closest space and scattered indiscriminately

through the story. Whole chapters are devoted to soliloquy and dissertation, during which the tale does not advance one inch, in order that the superiority of the writer to all religious belief may be unfolded, and the impossibility of faith in Christianity laid bare. Children of ambiguous age are described as haunted by doubts on deep problems of Divine providence and of God's dealing with the heathen, and after agonies of suspense attain to a consciousness of holy joy and peace, which is elaborately described only to be swept aside contemptuously as empty and delusive. How far the experience of facts justifies the picture of Boer religion as embodied in Tant' Sannie we have no means of determining, nor can we deny that there may have been instances of successful hypocrisy as foul and as flagrant in their hateful combination of cruelty and lying, dishonesty and greed, as Bonaparte Blenkins. But surely such examples of moral and religious corruption were better left to fester in congenial obscurity. Are the details of such rotteness fit for commendation in a high-class English newspaper 'for all and sundry to read'?

The morality of *An African Farm* is on a level that accords with its religious teaching. Lyndall, who always carries any point on which her mind is bent, contrives to be sent to a boarding-school. She marks out a line of life for herself very different from 'the rest of the drove,' as she elegantly terms her schoolfellows. 'Can you form an idea,' she asks, 'of what it must be to be shut up with cackling old women, who are without knowledge of life, without love of the beautiful, without strength, to have your soul cultured by them? . . . I told them I should leave, and they knew I came there on my own account; so they gave me a bedroom without the companionship of one of those things that were having their brains slowly diluted and squeezed out of them' (p. 169). We are mercifully spared full details of this young lady's acquaintance with the clever and handsome Englishman already mentioned, but we learn that she is about to be a mother, and the stranger earnestly presses her to become his wife. 'I cannot marry you,' she said, slowly, 'because I cannot be tied; but, if you wish, you may take me away with you and take care of me; then when we do not love any more we can say good bye' (p. 228). These brief extracts are absolutely necessary to show that we do Olive Schreiner no injustice. We decline to sully our pages with the narrative of a drunken drover's cruelty to his oxen,<sup>1</sup> at which we almost sickened. Such

<sup>1</sup> Detailed in Waldo's letter to the girl he loves devotedly.

descriptions are simply brutalizing. Naked realism of this kind is as hateful and, to our mind, hardly less injurious in its effects than the tales of M. Zola.

A long chapter, entitled 'Times and Seasons,' discusses the history of a soul upon lines suggested by the Positivist formula. The experience mapped out is assigned to Waldo, but the unbelief arrived at is shared by Lyndall and her stranger. 'I am a man,' he says, 'who believes nothing, hopes nothing, fears nothing, feels nothing.' To some of Olive Schreiner's admirers this chapter appears profound and 'full of ample sympathy with religious beliefs with which the writer has long ago parted ;' to us it seems 'full of the vulgar, self-satisfied vanity of a village coxcomb,' to use an expression of Mr. Crawford's,<sup>1</sup> made yet more offensive by pert quotation of words most dear and unspeakably sacred to hearts of holy men and women through long ages. To do the authoress justice, she does not impute hypocrisy to those who have affirmed that they have experienced the sense of divine forgiveness. They are only fools. We have her authority for stating that there are more fools and fewer hypocrites than the wise world dreams of. There are even some survivors of an effete and antiquated race to whom such words still signify a real bodily (*sic*) or mental condition. Such persons, worn out with spiritual fatigue, 'sink down emasculated. Up creeps the deadly, delicious calm.'

But the writer has consolation for us when the hopes inspired by faith have proved vain. When God fails to comfort, Nature (spelt with a capital) will supply His place. The conditions under which her balm is poured upon the wounded spirit are defined as follows :

'There are only rare times when a man's soul can see Nature. So long as passion holds its revel there, the eyes are holden that they should not see her. Go out if you will and walk alone on the hill-side in the evening, but if your favourite child lies ill at home, or your lover comes to morrow, or at your heart there lies a scheme for the holding of wealth [the appropriateness of this co-ordination is quite unsuitable], then you will return as you went out ; you will have seen nothing. For Nature, ever, like the old Hebrew God, cries out, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Only then, when there comes a pause, a blank in your life, when the old idol is broken, when the old hope is dead, when the old desire is crushed, then the Divine compensation of Nature is made manifest. She shows herself to you. So near she draws you, that the blood seems to flow from her to you, through a still uncut cord : you feel the throb of her life. When that day comes that you sit down broken, without one human

<sup>1</sup> *With the Immortals*, i. III.

creature to whom you cling, with your loves the dead and the living-dead ; when the very thirst for knowledge through long-continued thwarting has grown dull ; when in the present there is no craving and in the future no hope, then, oh ! with a beneficent tenderness Nature enfolds you. Then the large white snow-flakes, as they flutter down softly one by one, whisper soothingly, " Rest, poor heart, rest !" It is as though our mother smoothed our hair and we are comforted' (pp. 293-4).

We hardly know whether upon reading this passage Christianity is not amply avenged. Here is the ultimate revelation attained in a book which one wise critic informs us 'no one can afford to leave unread, since it throws new light on many of the complex problems of life.' We accept the dictum, though in a different sense from that in which the encomiast applies it. An *African Farm* casts a lurid blaze upon the inextricable blending of all that gives its charm to life with the Christianity which ennobles it. The Gospel once uprooted, morality sickens and taste dies, but we have a grand compensation. Instead of the lost hopes inspired by religion, we may inspect the intestines of dead fowls (see p. 132), or watch the falling snow-flakes, and be at rest.

In conclusion we desire to press very earnestly two thoughts suggested by the tone and character of that class of modern fiction of which *John Ward* in a less, and an *African Farm* in a greater, degree may be taken as typical examples. Our first thought is the importance of filling the minds of children from their earliest infancy with a sense of God's unspeakable and boundless love. Could such a book as the *African Farm* be possible save as the utterance of a mind warped and stunted in early life by distorted views of its relation to its Heavenly Father? In nothing perhaps is the contrast between Calvinistic and Catholic teaching more marked than in this respect. We can recall, with mournful experience of its pernicious influence, how, in our earliest years, baptized little children were taught to repeat, each evening, hymns hardly less horrible than those quoted in *John Ward*. When the minds of babies seven years old—that is, at the most receptive and imaginative age—are charged with visions of suffering and of their own crimes,<sup>1</sup> how can we wonder if

<sup>1</sup> The writer vividly recalls how at a lady's preparatory school he and his schoolfellows, of ages varying from eight to ten, had to repeat, as part of their evening orisons, a hymn which ran as follows :

And must the crimes that I have done  
Be read and published there :  
Be all exposed before the sun  
While men and angels hear ?

sheer terror takes the place of that simple love which should rejoice their hearts, whose angels do always behold the face of our Father which is in heaven? Our second thought is to recall a truth which is often overlooked, but which would serve as an effectual antidote to much recent scepticism—the truth that Christianity is avowedly but a partial revelation, and by its own confession leaves many of the problems of life unsolved. Christianity never pretended to furnish a key which should open all mysteries. It passes by in silence many deep questions which the heart of man will put, but to which it vouchsafes no reply. We may lament, we may even in our impatience blame the state of uncertainty in which we find ourselves, but no fair-minded critic can deny that the voice of Holy Scripture and of our divine Redeemer affirm it in the plainest terms. We know in part, and where knowledge fails we are required to trust. 'What is that to thee? follow thou Me.' That a writer has made shipwreck of faith does not alter the fact that Christianity is in this sense incomplete—a fact which sweeps aside, as irrelevant, nine-tenths of the assertions with which these books are replete, and which casts a flood of light on Newman's massive dictum that to a Christian ten thousand difficulties do not create one doubt. To the evidence of history and of personal experience on behalf of Christianity the careful reader of contemporary sceptical writings will add the strong, because undesigned, testimony of their authors that religion supplies the only firm foundation for all that makes life really worth living. We mourn unfeignedly over Lyndall's despairing cry, 'The lifting up of the hands brings no salvation; redemption is from within, and neither from God nor man'; but we know better. The promise is for us and for our children.

---

#### ART. VI.—MR. BARING-GOULD AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST IN THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

1. *Our Inheritance: an Account of the Eucharistic Service in the First Three Centuries.* By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. (London, 1888.)
2. *The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from Original Authorities.* By C. A. SWAINSON, D.D. (Cambridge, 1884.)
3. *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte.* Von Dr. FERDINAND PROBST. (Tübingen, 1870.)

LITURGIOLOGY has many *lacunæ*. There is a great deal of work that is urgently needed, and that work of fundamental importance to the subject. It must be repeated once more that there is urgent need of critical texts. We have ourselves pointed out<sup>1</sup> the mass of material for the criticism of the text of the Greek rites which exists, easily accessible, but as yet undealt with; and probably an enterprising search would lead to the discovery of much more. Dr. Swainson's *Greek Liturgies*, while it brought to light some new documents of immense value and interest, is disappointing, because the editor was so seriously wanting in true editorial instinct. And very little else has been done for the Greek rites. The western liturgies have been more fortunate, and M. Delisle's work on ancient Sacramentaries, which we noticed in our issue for April 1889, has made the task of the critic easier, and has rendered him invaluable aid, while at the same time it reveals how much there is still to be done. For the non-Greek oriental rites it cannot be said that anything at all has yet been attempted. We have, therefore, still to look forward in hope for a critically-sifted collection of the existing documents. At the same time it seems to us that there is some misapprehension still abroad as to what exactly is the result to be looked for. It will be found sometimes that writers on liturgical subjects complain of their texts, when what is really at fault is their own apprehension of the nature and relations of the texts. They fail to realize or to remember that books of the nature of 'Church services' and 'Plenary Missals' are a comparatively late phenomenon in liturgical history. They forget that, before the invention of printing, books containing the whole service were rare, and for more than a thousand years unknown, and each minister had his own book containing that part of the text which concerned

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1885, vol. xx. No. 39.

his special ministration, and only selections from the rest, or the clue-words, or not even that; while rubrics were as few as possible. And even since the invention of printing the system has by no means been abandoned.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, contemporary copies of the same service may vary indefinitely, without pointing to any difference in the rite. They may differ only in the extent of ground covered. When, therefore, Dr. Swainson<sup>2</sup> points to a text of the end of the thirteenth century, which is much shorter and simpler than other contemporary documents, as indicating the survival of a simpler rite, he is merely misapprehending his data. And this he would have realized, if he had noticed that there are modern Greek altar-books—we have before us one published at Venice in 1845—which are practically only a few lines longer than the text of the earliest known manuscript of ‘St. Basil’ and ‘St. Chrysostom,’ the Barberini MS. of the eighth century, which he prints.<sup>3</sup> And again it needs remembering that an action does not become more complicated for being described, and a rubric is after all only a more or less minute description of an action which may be otherwise known, in a general way, to be indefinitely old. A rubricated document, therefore, does not necessarily point to a more elaborate rite than an unru-bricated, and this apart from the fact that in some periods and regions there has been a custom of including the rubrics in a volume apart. This consideration, we quite admit, needs very cautious application; all we wish to insist upon in these remarks is that the real history of rites cannot be arrived at by a merely mechanical comparison of texts, however critically excellent, and that, therefore, the significance of critical texts may be exaggerated or at least developed in wrong directions, a mistake into which Dr. Swainson seems to us to have fallen.

But the mention of comparison suggests another of our needs. A thoroughly rigorous comparison of texts has not yet been made, nor the possible and probable fruitfulness of such a comparison yet been tested. The texts of individual liturgies and of families of liturgies ought to be compared one with another in thorough detail, with a view to a discovery of their mutual relations and affinities, and their influence in modifying one another. And we feel confident that important results would follow from such a method, and that it is the indispensable preliminary of any effectual dealing with some texts. It has often been attempted to some extent, but with

<sup>1</sup> The edition of the Coptic rites, lately printed at Cairo, has its ‘diaconica’ in a separate volume.

<sup>2</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1885, vol. xx. No. 39, p. 27.

fa  
vi  
pa  
lit  
Se  
to  
Ja  
Be  
on  
w  
qu  
st  
pr  
su  
re

F  
an  
of  
de  
al  
In  
Fo  
a  
as  
ov  
an  
su  
wh  
lo  
ta  
try  
po  
po  
lea  
re  
fro

firs  
ou  
dis  
Th  
sq

far too much inexactness and generality, whereas we are convinced that if it were done with adequate rigour such a comparison would open up unexpected relationships, and suggest lines of historical inquiry of great interest and fruitfulness. Sixty years ago Sir William Palmer<sup>1</sup> asserted and did much to demonstrate that the Greek texts of the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark had been modified by the influence of the Byzantine rite, before being displaced by it in the use of the orthodox of Syria and Egypt; but we have never seen this worked out in detail, nor the real relations of these rites adequately determined. This must be done before we can reconstruct the liturgical situation of the fourth century. And the process of such an investigation would give an opportunity for supplying what Dr. Harnack asked for in his too favourable review of Dr. Swainson's *Greek Liturgies*,<sup>2</sup> a concordance of the existing liturgical texts.

Again, there is need of research among the writings of the Fathers for quotations and allusions, with a view to testing the antiquity of the wording of the liturgies, and to the filling out of ritual details. It is well known that a great deal has been done in this direction and with valuable results;<sup>3</sup> but much also has been attempted with largely unsatisfactory results. In fact, it seems to have been undertaken by the wrong people. For this task there is needed an investigator who combines a thorough and minute knowledge of the liturgical texts with as thorough a sobriety of judgment; he must be acute without oversubtlety, and must be able to exercise a strong self-denial, and to make the least rather than the most of his apparent results. And these qualities have not been characteristic of some who have worked industriously in this field. Instead of first looking for explicit quotations and allusions which are unmistakeable so soon as pointed out, they have been too fond of trying to trace subtle sequences of thought which are supposed to indicate a covert allusion to the liturgy. The supposed coincidences are sometimes fantastic and illusory, or at least quite unconvincing, and sometimes they are only the recurrence of familiar sequences of thought and fact drawn from the Bible, or from the common store of the faith, and con-

<sup>1</sup> *Origines Liturgicae* (4th ed. London, 1845), pp. 24 sqq., 94 sqq. The first edition was issued in 1832.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung*.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Mr. Hammond's *Liturgy of Antioch* (Oxon. 1879), collected out of St. Chrysostom's writings. It is to be regretted that he did not distinguish between the Antiochene and the Constantinopolitan works. This has been done by Probst in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.* 1883, pp. 250 sqq.

sequently they do not necessarily carry us very far. And when we come to examine the argument of such authors as we refer to, we find it often such as will scarcely commend itself to the average judgment. We have placed at the head of this article the name of Professor Probst's *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte*, and to much of it our remarks apply. Professor Bickell, a friendly critic, says of it: 'Probst has with wonderful acuteness attempted to trace the whole contents of the Eucharistic Thanksgiving of the *Apostolic Constitutions* in the Pauline epistles; but his deduction rests on so many scarcely proved assumptions that we can hardly expect his results to be accepted on the part of dogmatic opponents.'<sup>1</sup> The same criticism is applicable to his treatment of the ante-Nicene Fathers. And the criticism is forbearing; we suspect some irony in the word 'acuteness.' We think much of the book will appear to many readers to be simple special-pleading. But Probst none the less will compare favourably with Mr. Moultrie and Mr. Field, who, by way of supplementing Dr. Neale's astonishing argument about liturgical quotations in the New Testament, have familiarized us with this method in England.<sup>2</sup>

There is one other desideratum we must allude to. The question of the relation of the Christian rites to the Jewish still waits for investigation, and Bishop Lightfoot reminds us that a preliminary question has to be settled before this investigation is possible. The much-needed inquiry into the origin of the earliest extant Liturgies 'must include a careful study of the prayers of the Synagogue, with a view to ascertaining their antiquity.'<sup>3</sup> What progress has been made in this preliminary inquiry we do not know; but in the further investigation, though Professor Bickell has done us a valuable service in his *Messe u. Pascha*, there is still much unattempted.

The appearance of a new book of 450 pages on early liturgiology might well encourage a hope of some contribution to our many needs. But at the outset of Mr. Baring-Gould's *Our Inheritance* we are promptly warned off from any such expectation. He tells us at once that he does not aspire to attempt the programme suggested by Bishop Lightfoot, or to offer us anything very new. What he does promise is to attempt to sum up the results already attained, and to offer a few suggestions as to lines on which the student may with

<sup>1</sup> *Messe u. Pascha*, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Neale, *Essays in Liturgiology*, xv. (London, 1863). Field, *The Apostolic Liturgy and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1882).

<sup>3</sup> Lightfoot, *St. Clement of Rome*, Appendix, p. 270.

advantage pursue research. We know, then, more or less what to expect ; but we should understate the truth if we said that the execution is more than disappointing. When we are promised a summary of 'results already attained,' we naturally expect that they will be results which are widely received, and are the accepted basis of present work on the subject in hand. We look for something which, on the whole, may be assumed to commend itself to anyone who is at all familiar with the matter, and which may confidently be put into the hands of any who may wish to become acquainted with it. But when we come to examine Mr. Baring-Gould's work we find that the 'results,' when they are not Probst's—and we may question whether Probst's conclusions can indiscriminately be called 'results' and be safely popularized—are Mr. Baring-Gould's own, and those results such as we cannot think will at all commend themselves to anyone who takes the trouble to examine them and their antecedents. In fact, we think he might just as well have offered them as contributions to the aim which he disclaims, as to that which he undertakes ; and, indeed, in the course of the work he scarcely pretends to keep within the limits he lays down at the outset. And it is not only the 'results' that are open to serious criticism, but the whole book in every aspect. He tells us in the preface that what has moved him to publication is 'a reluctance to let go unpreserved materials collected and conclusions arrived at on a very important subject.' Readers of the book will be disposed to regret that this reluctance was not kept in check until his 'many pursuits and much distraction' should have left him time for maturer reflection, and for some effort to get his work into form, and to improve his method and correct his facts.

For his literary form is extraordinary. It might lead us to suppose that he had emptied his common-place book bodily into the printing-press. In speaking of the *Apostolic Constitutions* he suggests a question which we might turn back upon himself : 'What was the object of the editor in thus giving his library of . . . odds and ends an authority which it could not legitimately claim'—in this case, the authority of 'results'? The book reads for all the world like notes taken down from a lecture, or a collection of postscripts. The division of paragraphs, and sometimes of chapters, is quite arbitrary, and stands in no obvious relation to the divisions of his subject-matter. It flows on with only a general coherence, a series of jottings, some of which from time to time seem to have got quite astray. And it is not only to his general form

that we object: we are frequently jarred by details. He gives us English that is at least unfamiliar and inexact, and unceremonious phrases that suggest irreverence. We meet with such words as 'Jewdom,' 'catechumenical,' 'Diocletianic,' 'Edessian,' 'typal' (in the sense of 'typical'), and we hear of a 'concordance' of the Gospels where a 'harmony' is meant. Without lingering to remind Mr. Baring-Gould that the Asia of the Paschal controversy was not Asia Minor, we will only say that, if it had been, its inhabitants would not have been called 'Lesser Asiatics,' unless we are all to be called Great Britons. To say that 'it would be quite inconsistent with the gravity and calm of Christ to leave all this to be done in a scramble at the last moment' (p. 165) is jarring to our sense of reverence. And this last is an instance of a characteristic which readers of Mr. Baring-Gould will not be surprised to find reappearing in this book, as elsewhere: he rather likes to jar and shock his readers. He has a chapter on the formation of the Gospels, and in the course of it (p. 120) he quotes a verse of St. Matthew in a mutilated form, and then tells us that, having misunderstood his materials, 'the Matthew compiler made nonsense of the sentence!' We need not comment on this. Again, in his chapter on the Agape he is much too eager to insist on the fact that scandals occurred. We have no wish to question or to disguise it; but we do not see why Mr. Baring-Gould should dwell upon it as he does, and quote a passage from Tertullian—from the *De Jejuniis*, by the way!—in which the clause for the sake of which he quotes it is too bad for translation (p. 182). All he wants to insist upon could have been put effectually in a sentence or two, and we do not understand why he dwells upon details of this sort in a 'popular' book, unless it be that he likes to say unexpected things.

The mention of the chapter on the Gospels reminds us of another characteristic of the book. It is much padded. A very small excuse is sufficient to entice Mr. Baring-Gould into an excursus. A chapter on 'Symmetrical Structure' lays a broad basis for a 'result' too meagre to be called fantastic. The Lections suggest the excursus we have mentioned on the origin and formation of the Gospels, apparently summarizing the author's work on *The Lost and Hostile Gospels*. The question of unleavened bread is excuse for a discussion of the Paschal controversy, a discussion for which Mr. Baring-Gould's style is not the best suited. And throughout there is too much eagerness to throw in information not to the point.

But peculiarities of style will cease to be surprising when

the reader discovers (p. 59) that 'St. Paul certainly took great pains to give literary roundness and compactness to his writings, to give them form and style.' And the importance of what we have so far noticed lies in the fact that the literary form is a fair index of the quality of the matter of the book. It is no more slovenly in form than in content. It is not in the region of fact and of the accuracy which historical statement demands that Mr. Baring-Gould is strong. When he is telling a story, as he often does, or giving rein to his imagination, or becomes rhetorical, and is untrammelled by the exigencies of exact fact, we have not generally so much to complain of. But we are bound to warn our readers that they must not trust him for accuracy in the simplest and most accessible matter of fact. And there is really no excuse for him. He appears to trust to an inaccurate memory in cases where we have a right to ask that he shall refer to his authorities before giving statements about them to the world. Instances of nearly every form of carelessness are plentiful. He has no conception at all of the necessity of accuracy. He discusses the difficulty as to the position given to the altar of incense in Heb. ix., and he tells us that the translators of 1611 tried to mitigate the difficulty by rendering *θυσιαστήριον* by 'censer.' We should of course assume that this is a misprint for *θυμιατήριον*, were it not that the following argument is made to turn on the alleged fact that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews used the ordinary word for the Christian altar! (p. 92). Nor is this a momentary slip; it reappears later on (p. 369). But we are no better off when he does look at his authorities before quoting them. He gives us, for example (p. 134), the directions of St. Ignatius as to the keeping of the Sabbath—of course in their chronological place between those of Barnabas and Irenaeus; but then he quotes from the interpolated epistle (*Magnes.* 9), and that in a case where the interpolator simply inverts St. Ignatius, and makes him say the opposite to what in fact he did say. Again, Mr. Baring-Gould quotes (p. 196) an interesting passage of St. Irenaeus (the marginal reference, by the way, is wrong according to any reckoning: it is really *Haer.* iv. 18, § 2, ed. Bened.), where the author is explaining the relation of the Christian sacrifice to the Jewish, and says that the *genus oblationum* remains, while the *species* is changed. Mr. Baring-Gould entirely misrepresents the whole drift of the passage, because he apparently thinks that *genus* and *species* mean the same thing, and that *in populo* means *in gentibus*. And, in fact, we have misgivings about Mr. Baring-Gould's Latin

and Greek. He sometimes goes back upon etymologies in a way that is suspicious, and thinks, for example, that *competentes* can be represented by 'seekers,' and that *τελετή* in the Areopagite means an 'end.' And we are not quite sure that a certain haziness as to the meaning of the present participle has not something to do with his theory about *φωτιζόμενοι* (p. 123). Again, his treatment of historical facts is no better than his treatment of authors. He tells us that the eight books of the *Apostolical Constitutions* were published between 320 and 340, and that the work was known and quoted in this edition by Epiphanius just after the middle of the fourth century. So far as Epiphanius is concerned, this we believe is exactly what is not held to be the case. Epiphanius has not been decisively shown to quote from more than the first six books,<sup>1</sup> and he uses a text so different from the text we possess that it is necessary to suppose either that he quoted loosely from memory, or that the text has been considerably changed since his time, or both. And A.D. 374–376, the date of the *Heresies*, is not very accurately described as 'just after the middle of the fourth century'; but perhaps it is near enough if a 'remonstrance of Tertullian' can be dated as 'before the breaking forth of the Diocletianic persecution' (p. 40). Chronology is not a strong point with Mr. Baring-Gould: Abercius, who is still bishop of Hierapolis, died at the beginning of the second century (p. 306); Ignatius fell a martyr in 110 and died in 107 (pp. 8, 336); and Constantine sent a baptismal vestment to Cyril of Jerusalem (p. 9). And this slovenliness does not only affect incidental details; it is no better with what is of the substance of the subject of the book. No more dependence can be placed on the author here in the simplest matter of fact. We are told that the Great Intercession in 'S. Mark' is 'after the Triumphal Hymn' (p. 23); that the Nestorian 'SS. Adaëus and Maris' and 'Apostles' are two Liturgies (p. 291), belonging to a type almost identical, if not altogether identical, with that given in the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (p. 13); and that the intercession they contain 'before the oblation' is for the dead, as distinct from the commemoration of the living 'in its primitive place' (p. 23); that the Liturgy of Constantinople has three lections (p. 104); that the Mozarabic Liturgy is used 'in the one side chapel of

<sup>1</sup> But see *Ch. Qu. Rev.*, July 1888, p. 316, where we have pointed out a possible allusion to *Ap. Const.* vii. 46. And of course there is no reason why Epiphanius should not have quoted all the eight books: see below.

the glorious Cathedral of *Seville*' (p. 229) ; that the *orarium* ' retains its name in the East, but has become the maniple in the West' (p. 239). And this treatment of facts where it is easy to test him throws light on the value of the dogmatic attitude which Mr. Baring-Gould sometimes adopts, and on a certain omniscience he displays. The true rendering of *ἐπιούσιος* in the Lord's Prayer 'is certainly "supersubstantial" or "supernatural"' (p. 319) ; he knows the order of the Popes in Hegesippus (p. 35) ; that the *λόγια* of St. Matthew were 'discourses' (p. 117) ; and that the Asiatics 'kept' the evening of Nisan 14 in commemoration of the *Last Supper* (p. 161). When this dogmatic manner appears in the statement of 'results' it is misleading and confusing. He states his own conjectures as if they were well-established and well-known facts, and it is often only some way on, if at all, that he lets us know that we are not on firm ground. We shall have occasion below to refer to some of these conjectures.

Meanwhile there are two other points in Mr. Baring-Gould's manner to which we will allude. The want of appreciation of facts, to which we have already referred, as well as the direction in which his tastes and capacities really lie, are further illustrated by the daring and extravagant flight of imagination to which he abandons himself on pp. 112 fol. We should like to quote the passage if we had space ; but we must be content with saying that he suggests that the series of lections in the Liturgy, from the Old Testament, the Epistles, and the Gospels, is a sort of reversed dramatic reflection of the series of testimonies of the false witnesses at the trial of our Lord ; and that the Gospel Lights similarly reproduce the torches held, according to Jewish custom, before the face of the accused, to enable the witnesses to assure themselves of his identity ! And as to the truth of this astonishing suggestion, all Mr. Baring-Gould has to remark is, that 'we cannot say' whether or not the custom descended from Apostolic institution and was a reminiscence of the scene in the hall of Caiaphas ! This extravagance, so far as we remember, stands alone in the book ; but it shows how far the author can go, and throws light on the degree of solid probability which we can hope for in his reconstruction of early liturgical history. Such, really unimaginative, use of the imagination is possible in furtherance of very different interests from those which Mr. Baring-Gould has at heart, and it is a perilous instrument. The other point which we desire to notice is that Mr. Baring-Gould's inaccuracy extends to his use of the technical phraseology of his subject. A tiro in liturgical matters knows quite

well that a Liturgy is divided into two *missæ*, called the *M. catechumenorum* and the *M. fidelium*; the one, including the service as far as the dismissal of the catechumens, &c., occurring in the course of the prayers which follow the lections and sermon; the other consisting of the rest of the liturgy. Again, it is otherwise divided into two parts on a different principle —into that which precedes the salutation before the *Sursum corda*, and which has no satisfactory name (we doubt whether Mr. Baring-Gould's 'Pro-anaphora' is a possible word in the sense intended), and that which follows, called the 'Anaphora.' Again, in the Roman rite, the paragraphs which follow the *Tersanctus* as far as the end of the prayer (*embolismus*) appended to the *Pater noster* are called the 'Canon.' All this Mr. Baring-Gould throws into confusion: sometimes the 'Pro-anaphora,' as he calls it, is confounded with the *missa catechumenorum*; sometimes the Anaphora is identified with the Canon; sometimes it includes the Offertory, sometimes is used as exclusive of the Communion; in one place the 'Pro-anaphora,' in another the Canon, is made to include the Preface. And it is the more confusing that he explains the terms rightly in the Glossary. We may protest in the name of the popular reader, for whom the book is intended. Surely a glossary is not meant to be 'got up' before reading a book to enable the reader to correct the text as he goes; its purpose is for reference, to enable one to discover the meaning of technical terms as one meets with them. Then Mr. Baring-Gould introduces a new terminology when he calls the prayer for the fruits of Communion, which follows the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, the *Exomologesis*. Now *exomologesis* already has a technical meaning; it is used for the process of public penance, the course of penitential discipline. It is unfortunate, therefore, to attempt to use it in so new a sense. And, besides this, it is generally quite inapplicable to this feature of the Liturgy; it is only occasionally that this prayer is explicitly and specially penitential. But it is clear enough how Mr. Baring-Gould comes by it: Probst uses it. Only Mr. Baring-Gould has not quite understood his authority. We think it unfortunate, even in Probst; but he has something to say for it and some account to give of it. He interprets Origen's classification of the *loci* of prayer in the *De oratione* as constructed on the lines of the liturgy: therefore, finding *ἐξομολόγησις* following *εὐχαριστία*, and finding also the end of the invocation in the Coptic liturgy of St. Cyril to be of a penitential character, he identifies Origen's *ἐξομολόγησις* with this penitential act (Probst, *u.s.*, p. 167). This, apparently,

was at  
later  
possible  
ment  
only  
secre  
selves  
Barin  
from  
lution  
the 'I  
Access  
tion.'  
an att  
'Pray  
only  
munic  
the L

W  
detail  
them  
facts  
whole  
expres  
until

The  
Eucha  
Gould  
funda  
tions  
autho  
comm  
stituti  
varied  
latter  
used  
centur  
some  
great  
is a c  
anaph  
monly  
We ha  
tract o

was as far as Mr. Baring-Gould got, and he did not notice that later on Probst explains that this identification is not always possible, and that it is difficult to fix exactly where the element of ἐξομολόγησις occurred in the primitive rite, and will only venture to say that it occurred somewhere between consecration and communion (p. 403). We do not commit ourselves to Probst's argument, but only point out that Mr. Baring-Gould's terminology is not justified by the source from which he seems to derive it. Another surprising revolution is made on p. 320, where Mr. Baring-Gould identifies the 'Preface to the Lord's Prayer' with the 'Prayer of Humble Access,' and the 'Embolismus' with the 'Prayer of Inclination.' But this is probably rather a confusion as to facts than an attempt to improve upon phraseology. In ordinary usage 'Prayer of Humble Access' and 'Prayer of Inclination' are only alternative names for one prayer, preparatory to communion, and have nothing to do with either the 'Preface to the Lord's Prayer' or its 'Embolismus.'

We must apologize to our readers for all this criticism of details. We can only hope that we have made it clear to them that they must not trust Mr. Baring-Gould or accept facts on his assertion. What we have quoted is typical of the whole character of the book, and we can only repeat our expressions of regret that the author did not reserve his work until he had thoroughly reconsidered and corrected it.

The purpose of the book is to give an account of the Eucharistic service in the first three centuries. But Mr. Baring-Gould's treatment of his thesis seems to us to suffer from some fundamental faults. In the first place the *Apostolical Constitutions* are too prominent; in fact they are the staple of our author's materials, and his work is little more than a discursive commentary on a combination of two passages of the *Constitutions*. Now these *Constitutions* are a compilation of very varied matter, drawn up by an unknown hand, as early as the latter half of the fourth century (for all the eight books are used by the Ignatian interpolator some time in that half-century<sup>1</sup>), while the materials are largely of much earlier date, some of them indefinitely old. Among the contents there is a great deal of liturgical matter, and especially, in bk. ii. 57, there is a description of the liturgy, as far as the beginning of the anaphora; and in bk. viii. 5 *sqq.* a full text of a liturgy—commonly called the 'Clementine'—beginning after the lections. We have, therefore, two more or less detailed accounts of the tract extending from the lections to the anaphora. But these

<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, *St. Ignatius*, i. 253.

two accounts differ; the two liturgies belong to different types, as will be easily discovered by anyone who will carefully examine them. Mr. Baring-Gould alludes to this difference, but does not discuss it in detail; in fact we think he leaves the general impression that the two can be combined into a single whole. The significance of this will appear more clearly below. Meanwhile, what we wish to say is, that the origin, date, and intention of the liturgical formulae of the *Constitutions* are too vague and obscure to leave it possible to use them as a satisfactory *point of departure*. A writer in this Review<sup>1</sup> has pointed out that the 'Clementine' liturgy itself is a compilation, and seems to have been formed by dovetailing two or three documents into one another. Does not this open the way for the suggestion that, though the content is old, yet the structure, that is, the real essence of the liturgy, is of the date of the compiler, and that the very object of his selection of documents was to collect old materials out of which to fashion a rite of the type with which he and the readers he had in view were familiar? Anyhow it seems to us precarious to assume that the Clementine liturgy represents the customs of any geographical area wider than that covered by the liturgical family to which it structurally belongs. And we are not convinced that even that family is not given too wide a diffusion. We refer to what is called the 'West-Syrian' family, which is made to include the liturgies of Western Syria, those now included in the rite of Constantinople—St. Basil and St. Chrysostom—and the Armenian. But we are inclined to think that the Constantinopolitan, along with the Armenian, has a right to rank as a family apart. The story of the derivation of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, by successive revisions, from St. James, rests on very questionable evidence and is not fully borne out by the actual phenomena of the texts, while their divergences from St. James have been disguised by the process of 'byzantinization' which the present texts of St. James have undergone. But however this may be, it is not clear why the *Apostolical Constitutions* are evidence for more than the Syrian use. Mr. Hammond (*Litt. E. and W.* p. xxxviii) argues that St. Justin Martyr's description of the Sunday service (*Ap.* i. 67) is in remarkable agreement with the Clementine; and, since he wrote his *Apology* in Rome and his description may therefore be assumed to apply to the Roman rite of the time, that therefore the Clementine may be regarded not merely as Syrian, but as representing a widespread type. But this is scarcely conclu-

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, April 1882.

sive.  
*Acta*  
 unde  
 of all  
 which  
 to g  
 shipp  
 the H  
 accus  
 B  
 there  
 liturg  
 the C  
 such  
 elemen  
 phenome  
 reason  
 which  
 their  
 imagi  
 between  
 rearran  
 differ  
 these  
 during  
 conte  
 brant,  
 there  
 partic  
 Churc  
 corrup  
 than  
 proph  
 used t  
 was le  
 ential  
 Churc  
 interp  
 they  
 which  
 possib  
 great  
*Aposto*  
*'Apos*

sive. Obviously it implies uniformity in Rome. But the *Acta S. Justini* (ap. Ruinart) represent St. Justin Martyr, under examination before the prefect, as professing ignorance of all places of Christian assembly in Rome other than that in which he had been accustomed, during his two visits to Rome, to gather his followers. Why may he not there have worshipped with the type of service with which he was familiar in the East, and in his *Apology* have described the rite he was accustomed to?

But underlying this prominent use of the *Constitutions* there is the assumption of a single original Apostolic type of liturgy, which is supposed to be most closely reproduced by the Clementine. We do not see what grounds there are for such an assumption. That there were certain originally fixed elements, and even groups of elements, seems implied by the phenomena of existing liturgies. But we do not see what reason there is to suppose that the structural characteristics which differentiate liturgical families are not original within their own areas. What reason is there, for example, for imagining that the varying positions of the Kiss of Peace as between the Roman and the Oriental rites are the result of rearrangement in either case, and do not represent original differences of local custom? The determining causes of these variations of arrangement may be undiscoverable; but during the period while the formulæ were still fluid, while the content was more or less improvised by the individual celebrant, and while perhaps the framework was far from rigid, there was plenty of room for accident to determine which particular variety of usage should become fixed in a particular Church; while there is no reason to regard this variety as a corruption of an original uniform type, or as any less original than any other special variety. We have learnt now that prophets were much more important personages than we used to suppose, and we know that a special liturgical liberty was left to them (*Didache* 10, § 7). The presence of an influential prophet might have fixed the usage of a particular Church. But, however this may be, it seems to us the natural interpretation of later varieties of structure to suppose that they point to quite primeval varieties of local usage, behind which we have no need to look for a 'primitive liturgy' of which existing liturgies are modifications: in fact, it is quite possible that behind them we should find, not smaller, but greater variations. And as to the assumption that the *Apostolic Constitutions* approximate especially closely to this 'Apostolic Liturgy,' we have already pointed out that Mr.

Baring-Gould has not made his choice between the two forms contained in them. The same problem as is offered by the great historical liturgies recurs, therefore, within the *Constitutions* themselves; and we do not see reason to conclude that either of the types there contained is older than the type presented by the other liturgies, elaborated indeed, but, as we shall presently point out, still discernible in a form at least as simple as those of the *Constitutions*. We therefore question Mr. Baring-Gould's assumption of an 'Apostolic' or 'primitive' liturgy as a single structural form to which we may approximate by manipulation of the later rites.

Both the above criticisms we suggest with some degree of hesitation, but to the method by which the author proposes to arrive at this 'Apostolic Liturgy,' this 'typal Eucharist,' we object without hesitation: the method, viz., of mere 'conflation.' He appears to have made lists of the successive elements of the liturgies he has worked upon, and then to have massed them together into a new list, and the new list represents the 'Apostolic Liturgy.' Accordingly, finding intercessions in five principal positions in the texts, he tells us that the original rite contained five intercessions; finding an invocation in the Roman Offertory and another after the Institution in the Eastern rites, he concludes that the primitive rite had probably both of these. And this 'conflation' is made quite independently of anything that may be known of the origin and history of individual features. He confesses that there is no early evidence for anything preceding the lections; but he finds intercessions among other things at the beginning of some liturgies, and therefore he inserts a preliminary intercession into the primitive rite—only, he explains, it 'went very early'! And he does not remember that the Roman 'invocation'—the *Veni Sanctificator*—was imported late into the Roman rite from an occasional Gallican use.<sup>1</sup> Well, besides these five intercessions and two invocations, the 'Apostolic Liturgy' had a Great Thanksgiving of the same dimensions as that of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, only that it probably had three recitations of the *Tersanctus*! Obviously, then, it was inordinately long and very unwieldy, and was too much for human infirmity. Accordingly, during some not closely defined period, liturgical history was determined by the effort to accommodate this infirmity, and to reduce the liturgy to such dimensions as human nature could put up with. The process began apparently in 306, for the Apostolic Liturgy continued 'in use throughout the Church from Pentecost till

<sup>1</sup> *Microl.* 11; *Martene, De Ant. Rit.* t. i. c. 392.

the co...  
in tha...  
produ...  
the pe...  
extan...  
forme...  
Roma...  
(p. 36)  
going  
'went'  
is not  
the se...  
'speed  
sixth  
before  
much  
them,  
namel...  
are tol...  
uplifted  
(p. 19)  
know  
only  
Church  
and 'i...  
lieving  
cession  
more  
remark...  
was si...  
version  
worsh...  
crysta...  
the litu...  
became...  
the Th...  
the Cre...  
tissue.  
the aut...  
have o...  
West i...

<sup>1</sup> Is  
mind—  
collecto...  
1523).  
VOL.

the cessation of persecution by the accession of Constantine' in that year (p. 335); yet, none the less, the variations 'were produced after the middle of the second century, mostly in the period from the third to the sixth' (p. 349). Anyhow, the extant liturgies are the result; they are but wrecks of their former selves, or rather self; and the climax is marked by the Roman rite, which is only 'a rubble heap of abraded remains' (p. 365).<sup>1</sup> The intercessions were subjected to a 'thorough-going curtailment.' The first and the last of them respectively 'went early' and 'was speedily got rid of'; the process here is not further defined. Between the elimination of these two the second 'disappeared,' 'when the dismissals ceased.' That 'speedy riddance,' therefore, was after all not made till the sixth century at earliest—not to say that what 'disappeared' before it still remains! But two intercessions were still too much as they stood; so some churches 'discarded' one of them, and in others a specific form of human infirmity—namely, arm-aching—suggested a different modification. We are told that, whereas the Great Thanksgiving was said with uplifted arms, this was not the case with the intercessions (p. 19). No authority is cited for this distinction, nor do we know of any; and some 300 pages further on we find it is only 'perhaps' historical (p. 314). But any way, some Churches broke up the remaining intercession of the anaphora, and 'intercalated it with the Great Thanksgiving,' thus relieving the long strain on the arms. So much for the intercessions: the theory of the 'shrinkage' of the 'Canon' is still more surprising. The 'Canon of Praise' (we have already remarked on the ambiguity of Mr. Baring-Gould's 'canon') was simply the reflection of the 'Canon of Faith'—the conversion of 'what was subjective instruction into objective worship.' But after a time 'the faith was condensed and crystallized into a Creed'; then the Creed was introduced into the liturgy, and 'had its dissolving effect on the canon'; it became no longer necessary to recite all the works of God in the Thanksgiving after they had already been recounted in the Creed. It would take some space to unravel this strange tissue. We will only say that in the same paragraph (p. 274) the author remarks quite light-heartedly that the first notice we have of the admission of the Creed into the Liturgy in the West is in 589, and that it was not inserted in the Roman till

<sup>1</sup> Is Luther's description of the Roman Canon in Mr. Baring-Gould's mind—'illo lacero et abominabili, ex multorum lacunis ceu sentina collecto'? (*Formula Missæ et Communionis pro ecclesiâ Wittembergensi*, 1523).

1014 (this has something of the character of some other of our author's facts; but it does not matter); and as to the East, he tells us that its use in the Liturgy began there, but gives us no date; it is said, as a matter of fact, to have begun in 469 at Antioch. We are apparently meant to believe, then, that the Eastern anaphoræ have been dissolved away since the end of the fifth century, and that the Roman has been disintegrated since the eleventh!

The real starting-point for such an inquiry as Mr. Baring-Gould undertakes seems to us to be the passage of St. Justin Martyr, to which we have already alluded, *Apology*, i. 65-7. It will be familiar to our readers,<sup>1</sup> and we need not quote it. It deserves more study than it sometimes receives, and taken in connexion with some other passages in the same writer it is fruitful of results. It contains a double description of the service of the Eucharist, in one case as following a baptism, in the other as ordinarily celebrated on Sunday. The differences between the two descriptions, besides differences of expression, are only that the first omits the *missa catechumenorum*, and has a kiss of peace, whereas the second includes the whole Sunday Liturgy, and does not mention the kiss of peace. We gather that the service began with a lection either from the Gospels or from the Prophets. Then the celebrant preached upon the lection, enforcing its lessons, after which the whole congregation stood and offered 'common prayers' of intercession for all men, that all might come to the knowledge of the truth, and might live faithfully in obedience to the Divine commandments, and attain to eternal salvation. At this point in the baptismal celebration the kiss of peace occurred. Upon this follows the offertory; bread and the mixed chalice are brought to the celebrant, who 'receives' them, and the Mithraitic 'imitation,' which Justin mentions suggests a ceremonial setting of them forth on the altar (*ἀπόστολοι τιθέται*). Then the celebrant offers at considerable length an act which is described variously as 'praise and glory,' 'thanksgiving' or 'thanksgivings,' 'prayer' or 'prayers,' and 'prayers and thanksgivings.' We mention these expressions exactly, because, apparently in part on the ground of the use of 'prayer' (*εὐχή*), some writers (e.g. Mr. Hammond, *Litt. E. and W.* p. xl.) have concluded that Justin implies an intercession in the course of this act, whereas it seems to us that this inference is precarious. An examination of Justin's use of *εὐχή* shows that it is quite a general word for an address to God (see esp. *Ap.* i. 13). By com-

<sup>1</sup> See also *Church Quarterly Review*, Ap. 1882, p. 53.

parison of the present passage with others in which the Holy Eucharist is alluded to, we can make out roughly what were the topics of this 'great prayer.' It included an act of Adoration to the Father of All through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (c. 65); an act of Thanksgiving for the creation of the world and all things therein for man's sake (*Trypho* 41), for our own creation, and for the blessings of life (*Ap.* i. 13); and for Redemption, *i.e.* the liberation obtained for us by the incarnate Christ's destruction of the principalities and powers (*Trypho* 41), and for the gifts of grace (*Ap.* i. 65); and a commemoration of the Incarnation and the Passion and Blood of the Son of God (*Trypho* 41, 70, 117); and at some point apparently petitions (*αἰτήσεις*) for immortality (*Ap.* i. 13). By this 'Thanksgiving' the elements were consecrated, and became *εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή*, 'the Flesh and Blood of the incarnate Jesus'; and if the consecration is further localized by Justin, it is in what he calls 'the address of prayer received from Him' (*δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, *Ap.* i. 66; cf. 13), the meaning of which is, as is well known, much controverted. Perhaps the real reference is to the whole 'prayer' or 'thanksgiving' we have described, regarded as derived from the 'gave thanks' of the institution, which Justin goes on to quote, and if so, no further data for localizing the crisis of consecration are given us. By the words *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ* (*Ap.* i. 66), Justin leads us to suppose that, while the general structure of the thanksgiving was fixed, the details of its content were still more or less dependent on the discretion of the celebrant. At the end of the thanksgiving the faithful responded 'Amen,' and then followed the distribution at the hands of the deacons, and the reception on the part of all present. And finally the deacons carried the consecrated elements to the absent faithful.

This description will of course be already familiar to our readers. All we have desired to do is to define the impression, and to show as exactly as we can how much and how little St. Justin tells us. Here then we have a definite fixed point in the middle of the second century, which we may assume to represent the Palestinian usage at that date.<sup>1</sup> It is obviously simple, intelligible, logical, while at the same time it has wide possibilities, and is capable of development by internal

<sup>1</sup> Of course it is uncertain whether Justin was converted in his native land, and unknown how long he lived there after his conversion; but if his description, so far as it goes, represents a stage of liturgical development, and if that development was fairly even, the Palestinian rite of the date of Justin must have been much like what he describes, whether or not he has it expressly in view.

elaboration into the later known forms. And it seems to us too obvious to need insisting upon, that it is much more like the truth to suppose the later liturgies to have grown by a process of differentiation out of simple formulæ of this sort, than to assume an elaborate and unwieldy rite, however arrived at, of which later liturgies are 'abraded remains.'

But we can get another fixed point near to the end of Mr. Baring-Gould's period. As is well known, we have texts of the Liturgy of St. James both in Greek and in Syriac. The Greek as we have it has been considerably modified by the influence of the Byzantine Liturgy; it continued for a long time the use of the orthodox remnant in Syria, and obviously underwent a process by which it was conformed to the dominant rite before being finally displaced by it. And the principle of modification is not difficult to discern; the aim was clearly to give to St. James the general look and external form of the Byzantine, so that both would make the same impression on the *people*, and would appear to them to be the same rite. Accordingly it is such features as concern the people, and as affect the service as a spectacle, that have been byzantinized, e.g. perhaps the Lections, certainly the Offertory and the position of the Fraction have been modified, while the deacon's litanies, said with the people during the celebrant's inaudible prayers, have been added, the prayers themselves remaining unchanged. The Syriac text, on the other hand, is the use of the Monophysites. It may therefore safely be assumed that at least what is common to these two texts is earlier than the schism; in other words we may infer that the common matter is at least as old as the middle of the fifth century.<sup>1</sup> And this inference is confirmed when we discover that this common matter by itself makes up a practically complete liturgy, of course a considerably shorter formula than either the Greek or the Syriac in their present condition, but yet a fairly full one. The comparison of the texts gives us the following common basis:

- i. *Lections*, with Trisagion.  
*Dismissals*.
  - ii. Three 'prayers of the faithful,' in connexion with which the Creed is said and the *Kiss of Peace* given.
  - iii. The 'Grace of our Lord,' *Sursum corda*, *Preface* and *Tersanctus*.
- The rest of the Great Thanksgiving, concluding with the recital of the Institution.

<sup>1</sup> Renaudot, *Lit. orient. coll.* i. pp. xxxii sqq.; Palmer, *Origines lit. i. 19 sqq.*

*Invocation (μεμνηέσθαι οὖν, &c.)*

*Great Intercession.*

*Lord's Prayer* with preface and *embolismus*.

iv. First prayer of inclination.

*Sancta sanctis*, manual acts (in Syr., the Fraction is before the Lord's Prayer).

*Communion and Thanksgiving.*

Second prayer of inclination.

Out of this we must remove the Creed, which is differently placed in the two texts, and is known to have been introduced since the schism ; and then at least all that remains may be assumed to be of as early a date as the middle of the fifth century. Now, in 348 St. Cyril of Jerusalem lectured to the neophytes on the *mass of the faithful*—on that part of the liturgy, that is, to which they were admitted only after their baptism. And if St. Cyril's descriptions and quotations and allusions be compared with the liturgies of St. James, it will be found that it is not far from the truth to say that all the elements mentioned by St. Cyril occur in either the Greek or the Syriac, while nearly all the elements common to the two texts of that part of the liturgy with which he deals are mentioned or implied by St. Cyril : in fact all that is printed in italics in the above scheme. It is well known that he does not mention the Institution in its place : but we do not think this silence very significant. He has a verbal coincidence with the paragraph in which it occurs ; it has already been the text of the preceding lecture ; and, as he certainly did not regard the consecration as effected by it, there was no special need for him to refer to it in an address on the salient points of the rite, aiming at edification, not at description. To him the whole movement, beginning after the *Tersanctus* on to the end of the Invocation, would be a single paragraph. Where he goes into details, his allusions make it clear that he is commenting on a text at least closely akin to the text we have. He adds two features which are no longer common to the two texts—the hand-washing, which has fallen out of the Greek in the course of 'byzantinization,' and the singing of Ps. xxxiv. 8 at the communion, no longer mentioned expressly in the ordinary translated text of the Syriac. The oblation of the elements is now made in the Syriac at the beginning of the liturgy, and the Greek has been conformed to the Byzantine ; but perhaps the third prayer of the faithful is really an offertory prayer. We may therefore add St. Cyril's additions, and provisionally place the offertory with the third prayer of the faithful, and accept the enlarged scheme as presumably representing, so far as it goes,

the Jerusalem rite of the middle of the fourth century. As to the mass of the catechumens, on which St. Cyril does not comment, the Lections (including a sermon) and the Dismissals are implied in the allusions and in the whole character of the *Catecheses*. We have, therefore, ventured to put them in italics. The trisagion, according to the traditional story, was first made known at Constantinople somewhere about 430; perhaps, therefore, we may neglect that. We do not mean, nor do we believe, that this scheme represents the whole liturgy of this date; some of the other elements of the present texts are, no doubt, as old as the fourth century, and have only fallen out of one or other of them; and St. Chrysostom's allusions of half-a-century later imply a fuller ritual. But we are dealing here with what we can regard as more or less definitely verifiable. We must remark further that the theological language of the present text implies that it has been worked over in some parts of the rite to bring it up to the Ephesine standard.

Now, it seems to us that Mr. Baring-Gould ought to have taken these as his fixed points. Half his problem was to fill in the interval between St. Justin Martyr and the common basis of the James-liturgies—to estimate the extent of the development implied in their relation to one another, and to attempt to trace it. And here the *Apostolic Constitutions* would have come in among his materials. A fixed point, similar to that yielded by comparison of the liturgies of St. James for Syria, is arrived at for Egypt by a like comparison of St. Mark with the Coptic St. Cyril; but the accidents of the distribution of materials make it desirable to begin with Syria. The first topic that would have suggested itself would have been the Lection-system. St. Justin, we saw, mentions only one lection: while in the fourth century there is abundant testimony for at least two or three. Mr. Baring-Gould might have made it much clearer than he does that the tendency was to use lections from two or more of the great groups of the books of Holy Scripture, and to break the monotony of the series by the insertion of psalmody between the lections, the original of what now only survives in the shape of 'graduals' and *προκείμενα* and the like. He gives us no treatment of this psalmody, except in a casual reference (p. 103). His chapter on the Dismissals gives us no fixed points: so much of it as is not either a mere cataloguing of liturgical phenomena, or digression, is little besides an imaginary history of the 'Clementine' dismissals (p. 124). He does not tell us that the distinction of *missæ* is discernible in Justin,

as inc  
after  
qualit  
tion v  
cion (n  
neglect  
heretic  
would  
does  
neare  
fixed.  
Dism  
simp  
upon  
liturg  
princ  
the le  
to ag  
the i  
were  
of it  
bisho  
legem  
menti  
for d  
the G  
of as  
the y  
datâ  
humâ  
gemis  
cessio  
easy  
prayer  
in so  
made  
indivi  
Cyp.  
the in  
cessio

<sup>1</sup> A  
Wedne  
ii. c. 9  
sugges  
prayer

as indicated both by the point at which the celebration begins after the baptism, and by his description of those who are qualified to communicate (*Ap.* i. 65 *sq.*) ; and that the distinction was criticized and rejected by Justin's contemporary Marcion (S. *Jer. in Gal.* vi. 6), while at the end of the century the neglect of it is one ground of Tertullian's denunciation of heretical discipline (*De Præsc.* 41). A few such obvious facts would have given us something tangible to work upon. He does quote the nineteenth canon of Laodicea, which falls nearer to the other end of his period ; but that is all that is fixed. As to the next movement of the liturgy, from the Dismissals to the Anaphora, Mr. Baring-Gould's method of simple enumeration does not enable him to throw much light upon it. On the surface it is indefinitely varied in the several liturgies ; but it is possible to discern at least some of the principles of its development. A series of intercessions after the lections and sermon is perhaps universal ; we are inclined to agree with Mr. Baring-Gould (p. 251) that even in the Roman the intercessions which are now only said on Good Friday were once said at all masses. In fact there is some evidence of it. In the catena appended to St. Celestine's letter to the bishops of Gaul,<sup>1</sup> in which is laid down the famous maxim *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*, certain intercessions are mentioned and described in such a way as to leave little room for doubt that what are now the Good Friday prayers after the Gospel are referred to ; and they could scarcely be spoken of as they are if they were then said only on one day in the year : 'Cum enim sanctarum plebium præsules mandatâ sibimet legatione fungantur, apud divinam clementiam humani generis agunt causam et totâ secum ecclesiâ con gemiscente postulant et precantur.' This series of intercessions, then, we may assume to be universal, and it is easy to regard the prayers for the dismissal and the prayer or prayers 'of the faithful' at the opening of the *missa fidelium* in some rites as part of this series. Now, the oblations were made in the name not only of the whole Church but also of individuals living and departed (Tertull. *De Monog.* 10 ; S. Cyp. *Ep.* i § 2 ; 15 § 1). The close connexion, therefore, of the intercession and the offertory is a natural one : the intercession articulated, as it were, the intention of the oblations,

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Labbe, *Concil.* iii. c. 475. In *Ord. Rom.* i. they are said on Wednesday in Holy Week as well as on Friday (Muratori, *Lit. Rom. vet.* ii. c. 990 and note). M. Duchesne (*Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 164) suggests that the detached *Oremus* before the offertory is a relic of these prayers. Cf. Raban. Maur. *De Instit.* ii. 37.

the oblations embodied the intercessions. This gives the rationale of St. Justin Martyr's rite at this point. Then the principle laid down in St. Matt. v. 23 *sq.* accounts for the position of the Kiss of Peace in close connexion with the Offer-tory and Intercession in all but the Roman (and African) rite (*cf.* S. Cyr. Hier. *Cat.* xxiii. 3). This would yield the form found in the Clementine. Again, there is an observable tendency in the history of rites, plainly a natural and instinctive one, to consecrate actions as a whole, and then the several movements into which the whole action is divisible, by accompanying prayers. This will best be illustrated by the history of the Roman offertory, which in its earliest traceable form was accompanied by a single collect, *super oblata*, the modern *secreta*; a more developed stage is represented by, say, the mediæval English with its three prayers; and a further development is found in the modern Roman, where the offering of each element and the mixing of the chalice have each its own collect. This tendency explains such features as the prayer of the kiss of peace, the offertory prayers, and those at the removal of the veils; and it is sufficient to account for the three 'prayers of the faithful' in the common basis of the St. James liturgies. Once more another principle operates to produce a further elaboration. It is found desirable to supply some occupation for the choir and congregation during the actions and the silent prayers of the celebrant; and this demand will account for the introduction of litanies, like those of the Oriental rites, and of hymns, like the Cherubic Hymn of Constantinople at the Western *Offertorium*. Such principles, it appears to us, will account for the development of the elaborate forms found between the lections and the anaphora in the liturgies, as we have them, out of forms as simple as that described by St. Justin Martyr, as well as for similar elaborations in other parts of the rites. How soon they began appreciably to operate, it may not be so easy to say; but there is evidence that they were in operation in the course of the fourth century.

Coming now to the Anaphora: Mr. Baring-Gould gives us plenty of surmisings which he describes as 'probable.' It is 'probable' that the celebrant originally said 'Lift up your hearts and your hands.' Whether this is the cause or the effect of the distinction we mentioned above between the attitudes of intercession and thanksgiving, we do not gather. Any way it is a pure conjecture, for which Lam. iii. 41, quoted, probably enough, as the source of the *Sursum corda*, is scarcely a sufficient foundation. We have no evidence behind

St. C  
'prob  
call t  
mem  
of th  
a th  
the C  
about  
too n  
other  
from  
velop  
festiv  
the V  
topic  
eviden  
betw  
Wou  
of th  
ent f  
ousl  
of a  
And  
differ  
cycle  
daily  
I  
chap  
givin  
deals  
sugg  
apart  
to re  
down  
at so  
Ters  
histo  
seem  
gies  
(incl  
tion b  
but b  
cally  
autho

St. Cyprian's simple *Sursum corda* (*de or. dom.* 31). Then it is 'probable' that the *Tersanctus* (which Mr. Baring-Gould will call the *Trishagion*) was sung three times, once after the commemoration of Creation, again after the account of the restoration to the Promised Land, and again 'at the announcement of the Incarnation'! (p. 272). We have already mentioned a third conjecture—that the Creed tended to disintegrate the Great Thanksgiving. To what we have already said about this, we will add that there seems to have been too much tendency, not only in Mr. Baring-Gould but in others, to generalize at this point from eastern rites, especially from the Clementine. It is said by some writers that the development of the Christian year, with its round of fast and festival, has led to the reduction of the Great Thanksgiving in the West, and the substitution of commemorations of single topics varying with the season. But here, in the absence of evidence of change of usage, we do not see why this difference between eastern and western rites should not be an original one. Would it not be a more natural explanation of the phenomena of the western liturgies to suppose that they indicate a different fundamental habit—less of a tendency to expatiate copiously and meditatively within large general limits, and more of a predilection to deal with definite points one at a time? And perhaps it would not be difficult to connect this with differences of racial and national character. In any case the cycle of fast and festival will scarcely account for the almost daily variations of some Western uses.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Baring-Gould in his division of chapters treats the Preface as distinct from the Great Thanksgiving, and then in another chapter entitled 'the Consecration' deals with the Institution and the Invocation together. For this suggests that the Roman has no 'Great Thanksgiving.' And apart from this, it is really easier, for purposes of generalization, to regard the whole movement from 'It is very meet, right,' &c., down to the end of the Institution as a single paragraph, broken at some point, varying from liturgy to liturgy, by the hymn *Tersanctus*. And it has the advantage of combining all the historical commemorations into a whole, and this combination seems to us to correspond to the intention with which the liturgies are constructed. For of course in all rites but the Roman (including for this purpose the present Ambrosian), the intention is obviously not to consecrate by the words of Institution, but by what follows them, and the Institution is recited historically, and, no doubt, as Mr. Baring-Gould says, as 'the charter authorizing the Church to reiterate the rite' (p. 283). The

Institution is so recited, and then the next paragraph, taking up the words 'in remembrance of Me,' begins 'We therefore remembering,' &c., and proceeds to say, in effect, 'we fulfil the Institution and beseech Thee to consecrate the oblation by Thy Holy Spirit.' And here we think Mr. Baring-Gould has improved on current terminology by calling this paragraph 'The Observance.' It has been usual to divide it into two, entitled respectively the 'Great Oblation' and the 'Invocation,' where the 'Great Oblation' is intended to mean the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord. This of course, in the rites which have an Invocation or its equivalent, places the central sacrificial act before consecration; and, besides, the act is then often most inadequately expressed—as for example in the Byzantine Liturgy—'we offer Thee Thine own things of Thine own'—which are merely David's words at the offering of the materials for the temple (1 Chron. xxix. 14). We are convinced therefore that Mr. Baring-Gould's interpretation is right, and that *at this point* it is merely the material gifts that are offered to be consecrated. And if it be said that some rites are too strongly worded for this—as for example St. James, 'we offer Thee, O Lord, this fearful and unbloody sacrifice'—it is easy to answer that these words apply to the whole act now beginning, to the consecration in fact in which the sacrifice is accomplished. But we do not agree with Mr. Baring-Gould's interpretation of the Roman Canon at this point. We will say no more of his dreams about two original invocations, nor about the theory, which he shares with others, that the 'Veni Sanctificator' at the offertory is the Invocation. Nor will we dwell upon the reproaches he heaps upon this part of the Latin Canon as containing 'empty shells from which the kernel has been extracted,' and as consisting of parts 'without connexion and meaning'; while we are willing to believe that 'the Reformers' of 1552 'could not understand their significance.' Apart from all this, his view is that 'the Observance' has been 'folded over' the Institution, so that both coincide, and the acts and intentions and effects which the Oriental rites attach to the Invocation are, in the Roman, attached to the Institution itself. Now we have no objection to this as representing the theory and the intention with which the Latin Canon is now used; but we more than doubt it as interpreting the intention with which it was written and which it still embodies.<sup>1</sup> And when Mr. Baring-Gould says that 'the Western usage is a mere curtailment of the older' (p. 18), and suggests

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Thorndike, *Laws of Church*, iii. 5, § 18.

this as one of the points in which it has fallen away, by abridgement, from the primitive liturgy, we might wonder whether he had ever read the Roman Canon or compared it with an Oriental liturgy. We need not say that, allowing for the terser expression of the Roman as compared with Oriental rites, the former is as long and as complete at this point as any other liturgy, and there is not the least reason to suppose that it has been curtailed. We do not in the least understand what he means by what he says on these paragraphs of the Canon. They seem to us in full harmony with the corresponding tract of the Eastern. For if the paragraphs of the Latin Canon from the *Qui pridie* to the *Supplices te* be compared with, say, the Clementine, which Mr. Baring-Gould will allow to be intelligible and full of meaning, the two will be found to correspond even in considerable detail except at one point: and here, where the Clementine prays that the Holy Spirit may be sent down on 'this sacrifice,' the Roman asks that 'these things may be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel on to the altar on high in the sight of Thy divine majesty.' It has been proposed to identify these two prayers by interpreting 'Thy Holy Angel' to mean the Holy Spirit Himself. But this is difficult, especially in face of a similar prayer in the liturgy of St. Mark, which in place of 'per manus sancti angeli tui' has *διὰ τῆς ἀρχαγγελικῆς σου λειτουργίας*. And it seems to us that the reconciliation can be made much more simply. For we find the same antithesis in another connexion in the N. T. The same facts of grace are presented in two forms: we are said to be raised up with Christ and made to sit with Him and to be in the heavenly places (Eph. ii. 5, 6; vi. 12): and on the other hand the Holy Ghost is sent forth into our hearts, and is in us, and we are strengthened by the Spirit so that Christ comes to dwell in our hearts (Gal. iv. 6; Jo. xiv. 17; Eph. iii. 16, 17). In the same way then the Eucharistic gifts may be thought of as consecrated, either by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them to make Christ present, or by their elevation into the spiritual sphere, on to the altar on high. But however the forms of expression are to be reconciled in detail, there can be little doubt that they are identical in intention, as was seen clearly enough when the question of consecration was in debate between the Eastern and Western churches. Nicolas Cabasilas of Thessalonica, in the middle of the fourteenth century, retorted on the Latins that their own rite was against them, and embodied the same view of consecration as the Greek rites (*Exposit. Liturgie*, c. 30). It is wholly gratuitous

therefore in Mr. Baring-Gould to say that the Invocation has gone from the Latin form or is 'so disguised in the *Supplices te rogamus* as to be no longer valid' (p. 289). But in this connexion we should like to notice a paragraph later in the book, which we heartily welcome. Mr. Baring-Gould quotes from a private letter of Dr. Littledale's, in which he states a theory of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; the theory, viz., that

'the earthly Church and the earthly priest can offer nothing but mere bread and wine, and cannot make that oblation to be more, or more efficacious, than mere bread and wine. Christ is the One consecrating High Priest, who, by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, consecrates the bread and wine into His Body and Blood. Then, no longer mere bread and wine, but mysteriously subjected to a mighty spiritual change, the oblations are capable of being presented and offered not on earth alone but actually in Heaven. . . . They are, so to speak, caught up to Heaven in mystery, there to be offered by the great High Priest Himself at the golden altar' (p. 322).

This Dr. Littledale offers as the real interpretation of *τὰ ἄγαντα στοῖς ἀγάλοις, Sancta sanctis*. We confess to a real desire to believe that this is the meaning of the *Sancta sanctis*, an interpretation already suggested by Archdeacon Freeman.<sup>1</sup> But the absence of any early evidence of such an interpretation is a serious difficulty. If this was its original meaning, it had apparently been quite forgotten by the fourth century; St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* xxiii. 19) and St. Chrysostom (*Hom. xvii. in Heb.* p. 171 B) both interpret the words as an invitation and warning to communicants, without betraying any suspicion of any other meaning. But the view of the Eucharistic sacrifice expounded by Dr. Littledale is quite independent of any question about the *Sancta sanctis*, and might have been even more opportunely proposed in connexion with the *Supplices te*, and the Invocation which we have just discussed. For it is just the representation of the Consecration and the Sacrifice, and of their relation to one another, which is implied in the identity of the *Supplices te* with the Invocation. Dr. Littledale speaks of it as 'my theory'; but he must not be supposed to mean that it is a new theory which he has elaborated. It is in fact in all except the mere way of putting it perhaps the most persistent view of the Eucharistic sacrifice that we can discover. Its close relation to the mode of representation found in St. Justin Martyr and St. Irenaeus is obvious. It is also really identical with the conception found for example in St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Chrysostom among the Fathers, and in Cabasilas in the

<sup>1</sup> *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. introd. 14; cap. 2 § 12.

fourte  
the S  
we pe  
bread  
Sacer  
Lit. 3  
view o  
and h  
all th  
Radbe  
As he  
preser  
versal  
mater  
can b  
exclus  
offers  
tered  
conse  
we re  
priest  
grate  
fore th  
sized

A  
Great  
his vi  
and t  
shifte  
would  
We ha  
and t  
those offe  
those  
the fi  
cessor  
after  
not th  
much  
has a  
the P  
smoo  
contin

fourteenth century—the conception, viz., that by consecration the Sacrifice is made present, and that only in this sense do we perform any act of sacrifice (*sacrificatio*), except on the bread and wine (S. Cyr. Hier. *Cat.* xxiii. 8; S. Chrys. *De Sacerd.* iii. 4; *Hom.* xvii. in *Heb.* § 6; N. Cabasilas, *Expos. Lit.* 32). Nor do we think it differs fundamentally from the view of the post-Tridentine Roman writers, except De Lugo and his school. Only it supplies a link that is wanting in all these. But it is explicitly propounded by Paschasius Radbert in his famous tract *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*.<sup>1</sup> As he puts it, the earthly priest, on the one hand as the representative of Christ, on the other as the organ of the universal priesthood of the Church, offers the devotions and the material gifts of the people on the earthly altar. So far this can be called ‘the oblation of the priest,’ though not as his exclusively, but as that of ‘the whole family of God which offers it.’ But then it passes out of his hands, and is ministered by the Great High Priest at the heavenly altar, and so consecrated by the Holy Spirit; and from Christ’s own hands we receive it back from off the heavenly altar through the priest at the earthly altar, as His Body and Blood. We are grateful to Mr. Baring-Gould for bringing this conception before the notice of his readers; we could only wish he had emphasized it a little more, and not have treated it only incidentally.

After the Consecration Mr. Baring-Gould deals with the Great Intercession. We have already said something about his view of it—that it existed here in the ‘primitive liturgy,’ and that in the rites where it is no longer found it has been shifted and modified in some way or other. Here again we would rather regard at least some local variations as original. We have said above that the intercessions between the lections and the anaphora seem to be universal; and in some rites, those in which the Great Intercession is connected with the offertory, no doubt this Great Intercession simply represents those prayers. And we know of no reason for doubting that the first part of the Roman Canon was always of an intercessory character; the position of the memorial of the dead after the paragraph *Supplices te* is no doubt strange; but we do not think Mr. Baring-Gould’s theory of intercalation helps us much. In the Egyptian St. Mark (Cyril) the Great Intercession has all the appearance of having been inserted; it interrupts the Preface, and the junctures at both ends are anything but smooth, while the two halves of the Preface might well run on continuously. Multiplication of intercession is an Egyptian

<sup>1</sup> Cap. 8, 9, 12.

characteristic ; it might be said to be excessive in the Coptic rites.

Mr. Baring-Gould treats the Lord's Prayer as belonging rather to what follows than to what precedes ; and no doubt in some cases its preface does relate chiefly to communion. But it is better regarded as forming the continuation of the preceding movement. The Christian sacrifice is the offering of sons, the privilege of our adoption and our liberty (S. Iren. *Haer.* iv. 18, § 2 ; Walafrid Strabo, *De Rebus Eccles.* 14) ; it is natural, therefore, that it should be crowned by the 'Our Father' (cf. S. Aug. *Serm.* 227). And it is profoundly impressive to find that the highest effort of the Church's worship can find no words fitter to express itself than the prayer of our Baptism. But the order of detail in the liturgies at this point is very indeterminate, and the interpretation proportionately difficult. There is considerable variation in the order of succession of the Lord's Prayer, the *Sancta sanctis* and elevation, and the manual acts. Then again the meaning of the *Sancta sanctis* and elevation is ambiguous ; is it before God or before the people ? In the former case it is sacrificial and belongs to the preceding movement, in the latter it is an invitation and belongs to the communion. And as to the manual acts—are they symbolical in their original intention, thus belonging to the commemoration, or are they, as Mr. Baring-Gould treats them, really survivals for the most part of acts required in view of distribution ? We cannot discuss these points here ; we only refer to them by way of illustrating the difficulties of exact interpretation. Here again we can well believe that the liturgies embody different intentions, and that we cannot at present get behind the varieties they represent. The settings of the Lord's Prayer—its preface and embolismus—are not dealt with very adequately by Mr. Baring-Gould, and we have already pointed out the confusion into which he throws them. He gives us no facts from which to gather their age, while he might have pointed out some evidence of their existence within or near to his period ; in St. Cyprian's 'inter cetera salutaria sua monita et præcepta divina quibus populo suo consult ad salutem etiam orandi ipse formam dedit, ipse quid precaremur monuit et instruxit' (*de or. dom.* 2), which is quite analogous to the Western preface, and in the addition of 'quam sufferre non possumus' to the 'temptationem' of the Lord's Prayer, found in several Latin fathers, the source of which is apparently the liturgical embolismus (Westcott and Hort, *G. T.* Append. p. 9), and in the *Kύπε* which St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. xxiii.* 17) adds to *πειρασμόν* (see embolismus of St. James).

the  
artic  
have  
of co  
discr  
this i  
hymn  
would  
iv. w  
yond  
plied  
as is  
of In  
the w  
judgi  
groun  
not n  
tions  
givin  
O  
Goule  
than  
chapt  
forms  
comm  
again  
we d  
St. C  
tion,'  
thank  
earlie  
have  
eviden  
point,  
most  
intelli  
the p  
of the  
are the  
So  
task,  
and S  
space  
the pe

Reviewing now the whole tract from the *Sursum corda* to the *embolismus*, we may ask how far we may suppose its articulation as found in the fourth-century Syrian rite to have already existed in St. Justin Martyr's liturgy. And this, of course, cannot be fully determined. We can as we saw discern the Great Thanksgiving, and we may well believe that this included the *tersanctus*. The Preface, completed by this hymn, is certainly formed on a Jewish type, and everything would lead us to believe that the hymn of Isa. vi. and Apoc. iv. would be very early adopted into Christian worship. Beyond this, Justin gives us no materials, except what is supplied by the ambiguous *εὐχῆς λόγος ὁ παρ' αὐτῷ*. And this, as is well known, has been variously interpreted—of the Words of Institution, of the Invocation, of the Lord's Prayer, and of the whole of the anaphora, as far as to the great Amen. For judging as to whether it contained an intercession we have no grounds except the use of *εὐχαῖ*, which may include but does not necessarily suggest intercessions, and the allusion to 'petitions' (*αἰτήσεις*) for eternal life, in connexion with the thanksgivings (*Ap. i. 13*).

On the Communion and the Post-Communion Mr. Baring-Gould is not illuminating. He seems to get more hurried than ever as he approaches the end of his book, and these three chapters are a little more than a very rapid catalogue of the forms found in the liturgies, with digressions on frequency of communion, the 'Gloria in excelsis,' and so on. But here again we think that we have a clue in the minimum which we derived from the liturgies of St. James combined with St. Cyril. That gives us a preparatory 'Prayer of Inclination,' the act of communion, a hymn sung meanwhile, a thanksgiving, and a final 'Prayer of Inclination.' How far earlier than the middle of the fifth century this may be, we have not materials for judging—for St. Cyril gives us no evidence as to the two 'Inclinations'—and, at our other fixed point, St. Justin's description of the communion is only of the most general character. But the scheme of it is so simple and intelligible that we can have little doubt that it belongs to the period Mr. Baring-Gould deals with; and an examination of the liturgies of all families will show that similar elements are the staple of their formulae in the corresponding paragraphs.

So far we have only alluded to half of Mr. Baring-Gould's task, the bridging of the interval between St. Justin Martyr and St. Cyril of Jerusalem. And we have left ourselves no space in which to do more than indicate how he deals with the period from the Institution to St. Justin Martyr. The

fundamental fact which he regards as interpreting this period is the tenacity of tradition which almost certainly precluded alteration 'till the death of the disciples of the apostles' (p. 336); the 'unthinking conservatism' of a 'narrow conservative' like Polycarp (p. 156) was apparently the general temper of the Church. Even later, tradition held tenaciously to what it had received, in spite of aching arms, and nothing important, far less revolutionary, in the way of change happened till the middle of the third century (p. 350). In one department it seems to have been quite persistent, the vestments of the celebrant still reproduce the garments and the towel worn by our Lord at the Institution—and this accounts for 'the blind determination not to change' them which the Church has everywhere shown (p. 241). The content of this tradition as regards the liturgy is the framework which 'it is most probable, if not certain,' the Apostles agreed upon before separating; and in forming this framework, 'it is also most probable, if not certain,' that they would follow with all possible closeness the details of the original institution (p. 350). The closeness of this reproduction is marked, among other things, by the additional details found in the liturgical 'Institutions'; the evangelists only summarized the account, since it was already familiar in the full recital of the 'Apostolic Liturgy' (pp. 285, 350). A great deal probably happened at the Institution which the Gospels have not recorded; among other things, after the prayer of St. John xvii., our Lord probably began the ordinary Jewish Morning Prayer (*Schacharit*), which is a commemoration of the morning sacrifice of the Temple (pp. 142 *sq.*), reproducing, though in its existing form probably a little changed in order of parts, the Temple service. Into this He introduced His own Institution, substituting the consecration of His Body and Blood for the commemoration of the incense (p. 370). Accordingly, the ultimate source of much of the Christian liturgy is the Morning Sacrifice of the Jewish Temple. To what was so derived was prefixed the synagogue *Torah*, the service of instruction and prayer, which, in the synagogue service, follows the 'Morning Prayer.' The change of order in the Christian reproduction of the combination of *Schacharit* and *Torah* is accounted for in this way: the christianized *Torah* was really the Sabbath service, while the Eucharist was, of course, celebrated on Sunday. When the observance of the Sabbath was practically abandoned by the Church, the *Torah* was thrust forward to the last hours of Saturday, and so came to be prefixed to the Agape, followed after midnight by the Eucharist, and has become

the *missa catechumenorum* (p. 138), while the Agape has fallen out but has left traces of itself between the *missa catechumenorum* and the anaphora (p. 140). These are the main features of Mr. Baring-Gould's view of the origin of the 'Apostolic Liturgy.' There are obviously many, at least, very precarious links in the account, and we naturally feel some hesitation in following Mr. Baring-Gould on to new ground. But we have neither the space nor the knowledge for any profitable discussion of the relation of the Christian to the Jewish rites. Yet it is quite clear that there is a connexion between them, and, as we have said above, the question urgently needs dealing with.

Nor have we space to allude to the many interesting topics discussed by Mr. Baring-Gould in the course of his book. He is loyal to the Anglican rite, and says a good word for it now and again. He gives the satisfactory account of the Decalogue, as a 'farcing' of the Kyries with a view to giving them an application.<sup>1</sup> With his views about intercessions, we are astonished that he ignores the glory of our rite, the Litany; which has unhappily been dethroned from its true place, as the traditional Procession of the High Mass, and thrust away into the afternoon, in favour of the aimless parades which we now call 'processions.' And Convocation, alas, has given its approval. Mr. Baring-Gould might have said a word for one of the best features in the Prayer-Book. Perhaps the grace of his vindication of our rite is diminished by the unreasoning prejudice and unappreciative criticism with which he treats the Roman. At the same time he does not pretend that ours is 'incomparable,' for he suggests a reconstruction of it; and about this we will only say that we should be very sorry to have such a function imposed upon us.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Scudamore, *Notitia Euchar.* pp. 190 sqq. (ed. 1).

ART. VII.—ENGLISH MONASTICISM IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

1. *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries.* By FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET, Monk of the Order of St. Benedict. 2 vols. (London, 1888.)
2. *Visitation of the Diocese of Norwich, 1492–1532.* Edited by Rev. A. JESSOFF, D.D. (Camden Society, 1888.)
3. *Calendar of Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII.* Vol. XI. Edited by JAMES GAIRDNER. (London, 1888.)

THE religious orders of the Reformation time have had a very unfortunate fate. Not only were they summarily turned out of their comfortable quarters and reduced to poverty, but they were scandalously abused and defamed. And almost ever since the period of their first troubles this abuse has been repeated and re-echoed. Of late years, however, a reaction has set in. It has now become the fashion, not only not to abuse the monastic bodies of the past, but rather to laud and magnify them, and to give them credit for a large amount of virtue and utility. This has been carried to a great excess by some quasi-historical writers. We welcome, therefore, gladly an historian of their own order, who has dedicated two handsome volumes to the account of English monasticism in the days of Henry VIII. In this well-written and carefully-executed work we shall find none of the absurd exaggerations in which some writers have indulged, but, for the most part, an eminently fair and careful presentment of facts. ‘It would be affectation,’ writes Mr. Gasquet, ‘to suggest that the vast regular body in England was altogether free from grosser faults and immoralities’ (i. 38); but he adds: ‘Anything like general immorality was altogether unknown among the religious of England’ (*ibid.*). We are prepared to acquiesce in both these propositions; at the same time we are of opinion—an opinion formed from sources which Mr. Gasquet himself accepts as trustworthy—that the moral decadence of the monasteries was somewhat more serious than he is prepared to admit; that laxity of observance was the rule and not the exception; and that monasticism had so completely outlived its day that its suppression by some means or other was inevitable.

It would be difficult to find a better sketch of the condition of things in Church and State in the early days of

Henry VIII. than that which is given in Mr. Gasquet's first chapter. The corruption and inefficiency of the Church, and the miserable state of the population, as these are sketched for us in Dean Colet's famous sermon, and Sir T. More's *Utopia*, are freely accepted by him. All things were crying aloud for a reformation. What form was this reformation to take? Could it be brought about by the monasteries, supposing them to be reduced to the primitive pattern, and to be abodes of zeal and devotion? By the very nature of the case this was impossible. For in proportion as monastic bodies are observant, so are they withdrawn from any contact with the outside world, and utterly incapacitated from influencing the general mass of the population. This was the persuasion of the wisest and best-judging men of that and of previous periods. Hence monasteries were no longer founded, but instead of them, great men sought to found colleges, and, on the general principles of utility to the community, thought it not amiss that the revenues of some of the most manifestly useless religious houses should be diverted to this more profitable channel. Such an arrangement does not, naturally, altogether commend itself to a Benedictine monk, and accordingly we have in chapter iii. a studied attempt to deprecate and vituperate Cardinal Wolsey. In thus running counter to the almost unanimous verdict of modern historians, Mr. Gasquet shows the courage of his opinions. He also shows his historical instinct, for it is certain that Cardinal Wolsey, more than any other man, was the author of the design for the total suppression of monasteries. With him Thomas Crumwell learnt his lesson, and the King was only too ready to give ear to his advice. 'Wolsey's Bull for the wholesale dissolution of small monasteries,' writes Professor Creighton, 'was the beginning of a process which did not cease till all were swept away.'<sup>1</sup> Very interesting chapters are to be found in this volume on the Nun of Kent, the Observant Franciscans, and the Carthusians. In all these cases the savage spirit of King Henry and his advisers, the craft and duplicity of Thomas Crumwell, and the ready truckling of many, of whom better things might have been hoped, stand out in melancholy prominence. But, though the tints are subdued, there is nevertheless a colour given to the whole narrative by the skilful hand of Mr. Gasquet which is liable to convey somewhat false impressions. He would have us accept the statements of M. Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, as though they gave an impartial account of affairs, instead of a narra-

<sup>1</sup> *Thomas Wolsey*, p. 142.

tive carefully cooked and seasoned for his master's palate ; and he even ventures to quote, and that frequently, Nicholas Sanders as an authority, quite in the style of the late William Cobbett. The sad tale of the Carthusians, the miseries of which can hardly be exaggerated, has been told still more recently by a modern brother of the order, and, were there nothing else to stamp the proceedings of Henry with indelible disgrace, this alone would be sufficient. Mr. Gasquet appears to be in error as to the number of the religious bodies which took the oath of the supremacy of the king and of renunciation of the Pope. He says : 'The commissioners appear to have met with only partial success,' and in a note puts the number at 105 (i. 248). Henry Wharton, however, declares that he had in his custody no less than 175 such documents, being those for thirteen dioceses, and that he knew where the remainder of the original subscriptions were lodged.<sup>1</sup> Canon Dixon is probably quite correct in saying, 'The oath was taken in almost every chapter-house where it was tendered.' The alacrity with which the religious orders hastened to abjure the Pope is no doubt distasteful to Mr. Gasquet, but he must have read the history of monasteries very differently from the way in which we think he has, if he is ignorant of the bitter feeling with which the monasteries regarded the Pope. How could it be otherwise, when all they knew of the 'Holy Father' were curses and not blessings, unjust exactions, and heartless oppressions ? Mr. Gasquet is justly indignant at the slanders of the visitors of Henry VIII., but was anything much worse said by them of the monasteries of England than was said in the Bull of Pope Innocent VIII. in 1489, ordering a visitation of the monasteries, which declares that it had been represented to him that the inmates of many monasteries in England led a lascivious and dissolute life, to the destruction of their souls, the offence of the Divine Majesty, and the disgrace of religion ?<sup>2</sup>

The poor monks, indeed, in rejoicing in their freedom from the Pope, little knew what was before them. The petty persecutions and trying harassments to which they were subjected during the visitation of Crumwell's agents are well sketched in this volume, and illustrated by many quotations from the Calendars.

<sup>1</sup> Collier, iv. 264.

<sup>2</sup> Wilkins, *Concil.* iii. 631. A similar order had been made, on like grounds, by Gregory IX. in 1234. As an effect of the Papal order of 1489 came the revelation of the shocking state of the monastery of St. Alban's.

'We have very little information,' writes Mr. Gasquet, 'as to the misery and depth of anxiety which must have prevailed in the cloisters of England during this period. Their forebodings and communings with themselves on the events that were taking place around them must have been sad enough. It requires little stretch of the imagination to picture the dismay and consternation with which the religious must have listened to the reports of violence and injustice, which were carried to them as the visitors proceeded with their work. For years they had endeavoured to buy off the fatal day of doom by plentiful bribes to Crumwell and his master. On what was left to them they with difficulty supported their own existence and maintained the hospitality and relief of the poor which their traditional obligations required' (i. 283).

When, however, we find it set down as one of the greatest of their grievances that they were compelled to remain within the bounds of the monastery, we must remember that this was that to which they themselves were pledged, and the utter neglect of which had brought great scandal upon them and called forth repeated injunctions from their episcopal visitors. We should not quote these had not Mr. Gasquet expressly said in several places that he is quite willing that the actual state of the monasteries should be judged by the entries in the episcopal registers. 'It is not too much to regard the evidence furnished in the pages of these episcopal registers as giving a faithful picture of the state of the religious houses' (i. 36). Now in the Register of John Longland, Bishop of Lincoln, we have a good many injunctions to nunneries in the years 1530-31. From those addressed to Elstow, or Ulnestowe, we find that there was absolutely no enclosure of the sisters; that they went and came as they pleased; that many of them did not attend the chapel services; that they indulged in smart dresses, having high head-gear with cornered crests, and embroidered dresses with scarlet belts, and ornamented shoes, 'the veil thrown back like lay folk.' The nuns of Nun Cottam are censured for being very remiss in their services, for great disorders in the house, the Lord of Misrule being allowed to be introduced, and men dressed up as nuns. The sisters are said to 'wander about in the world,' from which had arisen 'many inconveniences, insolent behaviour, and much slander.' The injunctions to Studley represent the same state of things—nuns gadding about, sisters bringing strangers into the house, great debts, corrodies granted unnecessarily, a superfluity of servants. We do not wish to assert that the strict enclosure enforced by Crumwell's visitors was in reality done with a view to restore discipline, but merely to suggest that the religious had put themselves out

alate;  
holas  
William  
ies of  
more  
there  
elible  
pears  
which  
iation  
have  
umber  
at he  
being  
the re-  
Canon  
n was  
derered.  
ed to  
et, but  
rently  
ant of  
ed the  
of the  
ctions,  
ignant  
s any  
ngland  
1489,  
s that  
many  
life, to  
ajecty,

n from  
y per-  
jected  
etched  
om the

on like  
order of  
y of St.

of court for complaining of it. The religious had, in fact, abolished their own system, and by the laxity and neglect of their rules, which everywhere prevailed, had made the way easy for the tyrannical and heartless treatment which was inflicted on them. Had it been otherwise the country would never have endured the dissolution of the monasteries as it did. As a matter of fact it cared marvellously little about it. The risings in the North, which are generally supposed to have been due to indignation at the suppression of the religious houses, had really but little connexion with this, as we shall show farther on. Mr. Gasquet is very indignant with the sweeping and atrocious accusations brought against the monks in order to pass the Bill of Suppression. He does not think that a 'Black Book' ever existed, but as the same sort of charges are found in the *Compta* which actually remain, this is of no great importance. That such a vile indictment should have been openly brought against a large body of men and women without proof, and on the bare assertion of interested men, is one of the scandals of history; but does Mr. Gasquet make his case the better when he brings on the other side a laborious accusation of venality, corruption, and utter want of principle against the whole Parliament which passed the Bill? He would excuse the monks by accusing the nation. Does he actually believe that that Bill would ever have been passed, or that shameful indictment been tolerated, if those members of Parliament had not been individually cognizant of a certain amount of monkish scandals and *laches*, and if they had not been practically aware that the 'religious life' had become a pretence and a farce, and that strict rules and ascetic living were almost unknown? When Foxe, Bishop of Winchester, was thinking of founding a monastery, his friend Oldham, Bishop of Exeter, wrote to him to urge him rather to found a college, for, he said, the state of the monastic bodies was so rotten that they must needs soon be swept away. So thought the nation. The thing had to be done; the mischief was that it was done in such a scandalous way. The question of the actual amount of immorality to be found in the religious bodies at the time of the dissolution of course occupies a large space in Mr. Gasquet's work. He does not contend for angelic purity, or for absolute exemption from scandals. He is quite willing to be judged by the bishops' registers. Indeed he specially refers to the Episcopal Registers of Norwich to refute the accusations made by Legh and Ap Rice against the houses in that diocese (i. 355). Now when Mr. Gasquet made this reference, was he aware of what those Episcopal

Regis  
been  
it is w  
be we  
real c  
accor  
the c  
tation

'I  
credit  
out o  
there  
For a  
and d  
contin  
were f  
chose  
lent;  
of hab  
picio  
to the

The  
Mr. C  
slan  
repor  
mariz  
Nicker  
sequen  
been  
Dr. J  
says t

'we sh  
of We  
monas  
centur  
have r  
been.'

Mr. C  
and t  
(i. 73  
some

1

Registers of Norwich did actually contain? They have lately been published by Dr. Jessopp for the Camden Society, and it is well that some of the statements contained in them should be weighed, in order to arrive at a right understanding of the real condition of the religious houses at this period. We give, accordingly, Dr. Jessopp's *résumé* of the condition of some of the chief East Anglian houses, as deduced from these visitations:—

*'St. Mary's, Wymondham, Benedictine Priory.'*

'In the whole course of its history we hear little or nothing to the credit of the house or its inmates. The buildings were scandalously out of repair, there was scarcely the appearance of any discipline, there was hardly a pretence of learning and devotion maintained. For ages it seems that the Wymondham monks had been an unruly and disorderly set, and as they had been so they seemed disposed to continue. The condition of the monastery was disgraceful. There were free fights in the cloister; the brethren went in and out as they chose; the prior behaved like a madman; the servants were insolent; and, worse than all, more than one or two disgraceful instances of habitual drunkenness were reported; and there were grave suspicions of improper intimacies with women who obtained admission to the monastery.'

The Priory of Westacre (Austin Canons) is referred to by Mr. Gasquet (i. 351) as a house that had been grievously slandered by Crumwell and his agents. We turn to the reports of the episcopal visitations of this house as summarized by Dr. Jessopp. We find that in 1526 Bishop Nicke 'found things very bad indeed.' Again, at a subsequent visitation matters had not improved. There had been a terrible moral scandal, but on this we do not dwell. Dr. Jessopp appears to us to fairly estimate the case when he says that, if we had full information,

'we should find in the records of the last eighty years of the Priory of Westacre the history of the decline and fall of an Augustinian monastery, which was doing good work at the end of the fifteenth century, but which . . . in thirty years had become hopelessly deteriorated. It is difficult to see how such an institution could ever have recovered its character, or ever again have become what it had been.'<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Gasquet especially commends 'the severity of discipline and the mortified mode of life of this order' (Austin Canons) (i. 73). If, however, he will allow us to draw his attention to some of the episcopal utterances as to houses of this order

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, pp. xiv, xv.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. xxxv.

he must, we think, confess that there were some remarkable exceptions. We have already alluded to Westacre, by far the richest house in East Anglia. What will he say to the following account of St. Mary's, Walsingham, of the same order?

'Of all the religious houses in the diocese the famous Priory of Walsingham seems to have been the most disorderly and demoralized. The moral and religious state of the community was disgraceful in the extreme. The prior was living a dissolute and scandalous life. He robbed the treasury of money and jewels ; he went about in the dress of a layman ; he kept a fool to amuse himself and his friends with his buffoonery ; he was commonly believed to be keeping up an illicit connexion with the wife of one of his servants ; he behaved towards his canons with the utmost violence and brutality ; and the result was that the canons themselves were a dissipated, noisy, quarrelsome set, among whom the very pretence of religion was hardly kept up. There were evil reports everywhere, and not without foundation ; for the canons frequented the taverns in the town and worse places, and hawked and hunted and occasionally fought, and scaled the walls and got out of bounds at forbidden hours. Some broke into the prior's cell and stole his wine, and some sat up all night drinking, and rolled into chapel and fell asleep and snored. It is a shocking picture, and it is evident that it is not coloured too highly.'<sup>1</sup>

Again we ask did Mr. Gasquet really know what was in these episcopal registers when he appealed to them to confute the reports of Crumwell's visitors, or did he draw a bow at a venture? Before we leave this diocese we must say that the account of the great Abbey of Norwich is almost, if not quite, as bad as that of Walsingham, and that Hulme and some other houses seem to have been very like hunting establishments, the number of dogs kept within the walls being grievously complained of by the more sober monks. To illustrate a little more the alleged exceptional excellence of the Austin Canons, we pass to the diocese of Lincoln. From Bishop Longland's injunctions to the well-known Abbey at Leicester in 1532, we gather that the abbot had not said Mass in the Church for three years, and had not celebrated High Mass on festal days for ten years ; that he, too, like the Prior of Walsingham, kept a fool (*scurrus*), who marched at the head of the canons when they went to chapel, '*et in choro, cum tu ibidem existis, se stolidè exercet, verbis, derisionibus, cantilenis, ac alias, canoniciis in choro occasionem risus et dissolucionis manifestè prebens.*' It is hard to conceive such a state of things existing in a religious house. But there it

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, p. xxxvi.

is, under the bishop's hand, in a leading and conspicuous monastery—the house in which Cardinal Wolsey died. There are in this document two charges of immorality against individual monks, but these need not be quoted. We pass to Dorchester, another Austin house. Of this, the Bishop says that he has found certain abuses in it daily practised, which if they be not at once remedied it is to be feared that the monastery will suffer great mischief both in temporals and spirituals. We are much inclined to doubt whether the Austin Canons were better than the other 'religious.' Dr. Jessopp says their discipline was not so strict as that of the monks. He adds, 'There were some Augustinian houses where the canons were living a harmless, pleasant life in society, much as fellows of Oxford or Cambridge.'<sup>1</sup> We imagine this to have been very much the state of the case. The canons were about as useless as the monks. Bishop Longland absolutely prohibited the canons of Dorchester from serving parochial churches belonging to them, which was always to be done by secular clergy. If we turn over the annals of Dunstable, we may see how the canons of that troublesome house were hated by the townspeople and their neighbours. We are unable to discern anything which should make the country very anxious to retain either monks or canons for any special good they got from them. But it will be said that the doles to the poor were extremely valuable. This is a subject on which great misapprehension exists. The monasteries—the greater ones especially—were almost all in retired spots, far away from the centres of population. How could Fountains, or Furness, or Tintern, or Bolton, or Rievaulx benefit any great amount of the population by their doles of bread and beer? Yet we have what we can only designate as the clap-trap sentimental utterance by Mr. Gasquet: 'Every pauper is made to feel, by the cold charity extended to him in the poorhouses of the country, how cruelly he was robbed of his inheritance, by the destruction and spoliation of the monastic houses of the land' (i. 395). If the monks were such efficient distributers of charity, how comes it to pass that the country people were in such a miserable state of semi-starvation as they are depicted by this writer, when he desires to lower the character of the period which tolerated the great iniquity of the suppression? Mr. Gasquet might have saved himself the trouble of penning the laboured invective against Crumwell and his subordinates to be found in chapters x. xi. Nobody now defends these

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jessopp's Introduction, p. xxx.

men, or doubts their venality, corruption, and falsehood. But when this writer speaks with perhaps a justifiable exultation of Crumwell's fall, he might have noted the extreme injustice of it. The unscrupulous minister was condemned by the remorseless tyrant whom he served for the very acts to which he had been encouraged by the king; just as Wolsey was condemned for using the legatine authority which he had licence to use under the king's sign manual.

The second volume of Mr. Gasquet's history contains much interesting matter. He regrets that it was finished before the publication of Mr. Gairdner's eleventh volume of the *Calendar of State Papers*; but, notwithstanding this disadvantage, it is full of gleanings from state documents illustrating the rising in Lincolnshire, the Pilgrimage of Grace, and the dissolution of the various religious houses. Having had the opportunity of carefully inspecting Mr. Gairdner's volume, we have arrived at the conclusion that the dissolution of the religious houses had but very little to do with the risings in the North, and that the dispossessed monks took no prominent part therein, which makes the atrocious vengeance taken upon them for what they certainly could not help all the more unjustifiable. That the suppression of monasteries was thrown in as one of the grounds of complaint made by the rebels is doubtless true; but it does not appear to have been the originating cause of the movement, nor to have been the chief thing regarded in it. The risings were mainly due to the influence of the secular clergy and the fear of losing the 'jewels' of the churches, and in a lesser degree to the fear of the laity of having new burdens placed upon them. These movements, therefore, can hardly be used as a proof of the popularity of the religious houses, or of the deep affection felt for them. Mr. Gasquet says very fairly:—

'It is impossible to inspect the depositions of witnesses and examinations of prisoners on this matter without a conviction that the men of Lincolnshire rose in arms in defence of what they held to be matters of both Christian faith and practice' (ii. 49).

We shall endeavour to illustrate our position by some extracts from the careful summary of State papers in Mr. Gairdner's volume. On Sunday, October 1, 1536, there was a great gathering of the Lincolnshire clergy at Louth. The commissary of the Chancellor of the diocese was to meet them the next day, to assess their benefices for the payment of the half-subsidy due, to give them the Articles and Injunctions lately passed, and to inquire into their ability and readiness

to I  
amo  
chan  
mad  
any  
some  
lyin  
day  
from  
chan  
that  
learn  
a vis  
and  
pars  
clerg  
were  
miles  
proc  
churc  
tain  
watc  
' The  
Stew  
Hell  
Welt  
The  
arrive  
burn  
to re  
at C  
gent  
Lord  
the  
eight  
town  
Her  
his  
also  
of h  
was  
1  
2  
4

to preach as directed. There was a very strong feeling among them. They were not willing to accept the religious changes. They were not willing to have a fresh assessment made for their benefices. They objected, above all, to any inquiry as to their preaching powers. They had heard some disagreeable reports. Dr. Raynes, the Chancellor, was lying ill at Bolingbroke; but he had held a visitation the day before for the clergy of that deanery, and certain priests from Louth had been present, 'to see what order the bishop's chancellor would take,' and they had come back declaring that 'they would not be so ordered or examined in their learning.'<sup>1</sup> The laymen were also expecting on the morrow a visit from the king's proctor, to assess them for their subsidy, and were therefore quite ready to listen to the discontented parsons. Accordingly, speeches were made to them by the clergy, declaring that the jewels and ornaments of the churches were to be taken by the king, and only one church in five miles was to be left. Excited by this the men of Louth proceeded to take the keys of the jewel-chests from the churchwardens with force and violence. They chose as captain a cobbler named Nicholas Melton, and set a guard to watch the church all night.<sup>2</sup>

'The priests were the occasion of this business. The parsons of Stewton, Manby, and Welton gave them money. The parson of Hellow offered them 40*l.*, and the parsons of Somercokes and Welton and dean of Muckton encouraged them.'<sup>3</sup>

The upshot of this was that when the bishop's commissary arrived on the Monday he was mobbed and his books were burned. The clergy then hastened off to their several parishes to rouse their people. On Tuesday, October 3, they mustered at Caistor, twenty thousand strong. Then they seized the gentry, and made them swear to be true to their cause, and Lord Burgh having escaped, they hanged his servant. All the books relating to the subsidies were burned, and about eight score priests joined the movement.<sup>4</sup> At the neighbouring town of Horncastle things were proceeding even more fiercely. Here the unfortunate Chancellor, who had been dragged from his sick bed at Bolingbroke, was savagely murdered.<sup>5</sup> They also hanged one Wolsey, principally, it would seem, on account of his name, and nearly murdered other officials. A banner was now constructed and a proclamation put forth, and the

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, xi. No. 975.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* Nos. 968-970.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* No. 283.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* Nos. 970-972.

<sup>5</sup> Gasquet, ii. 63.

insurgents, drawing large contingents from all quarters, prepared to march on Lincoln. With all this the monks had nothing to do. Dr. Makarel, Abbot of Barlings, who appears afterwards as a leader, did not join the movement till the Thursday, and then upon compulsion.<sup>1</sup> Henry Thornben, cellarier of Barlings, deposes :—

' Heard that church jewels should be taken ; and after that all cattle unmarked should be confiscated. Thinks that the cause of the insurrection. Never saw ruler of religious house in the host, except his master. Saw monks of Bardney and Kirksted, and a canon, late of Welbek, and many priests.'<sup>2</sup>

Want of space prevents us following up the movement to its termination, but it may be observed that in the list of the grievances put forward by the insurgents there is no mention of the dissolution of the monasteries. Their alleged grievances are : (1) That every man is to bring his gold to have the touch of the Tower ; (2) that there is only to be a church for every five miles, and that all the chalices, jewels, &c., are to be taken ; (3) that every man is to be sworn as to the amount of his substance, and if this be found more his goods are to be taken ; (4) that no man shall eat white bread, goose, or capon without paying a 'certain' to the king ; (5) that a noble is to be paid for every wedding, burying, or christening ; (6) that all cloth is to be brought to a certain place and sealed, and if it 'go in or shrink' the goods of the maker to be forfeited.<sup>3</sup> This was evidently completely a rising of the peasantry and yeomen, stirred up by the clergy.

Of the far more important rising in Yorkshire, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, which assumed almost the proportions of civil war, we have not left ourselves much space to speak. In the twenty-four demands put forward by the 'Parliament at Pontefract,' the restitution of the monasteries forms one item, and that of the Friars Observant another.<sup>4</sup> But the twenty-two other singular demands show that this, too, was completely a movement of the clergy and the occupiers of land, and testify to the profound disgust with which the whole policy of Henry VIII. was regarded. In the king's terms offered to the insurgents nothing is said about the restoration of the monasteries, neither does this appear to have been insisted on by them. After his return from London we find Robert Aske, the leader, visiting some of the abbeys to which the religious had returned, and arranging that for a time the

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Papers of Henry VIII.*, xi. No. 805.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 828, No. vi.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 768, 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* No. 1246.

king's farmers should be reinstated in their charges.<sup>1</sup> We are inclined to believe that, could the insurgents have obtained the other concessions they desired, they would have been quite willing to abandon the monasteries. The monks were neither the movers in the revolt, nor in any special way the cause of the movement. Yet upon these unfortunate men the savage vengeance of the king principally fell. Mr. Gasquet examines at length the king's assertion that 'all these troubles have ensued by the solicitation and traitorous conspiracies of the monks and canons of those parts,' and shows clearly enough that this assertion is false. Yet there came forth that brutal order from the king to the Duke of Norfolk: 'We desire you at such places as they have conspired, or kept their houses with force since the appointment at Doncaster, you shall without pity or circumstance cause all the monks and canons that be in any wise faulty to be tied up without further delay or ceremony.'<sup>2</sup> 'There can be no doubt,' writes Mr. Gasquet, 'that the abbots and monks now tried and put to death fell victims to Henry's cupidity and sanguinary vengeance, and that they did not suffer for their own misdeeds' (ii. 158). Treachery and breach of promises were added to cruelty. The promises made by Henry's generals during the insurrection were not regarded, and everywhere terror and confusion prevailed. It is impossible to read the chapters in which Mr. Gasquet details the circumstances of the suppression of the various abbeys, as extracted from ancient documents, with graphic skill and power, but with no exaggerated denunciations, without feeling the deepest sympathy and pain for these oppressed people.

One thing, however, we must observe, which certainly does not tend to raise the character of the 'religious' of that day, though it may be excusable under the circumstances. 'The final catastrophe of Woburn was hastened,' writes Mr. Gasquet, 'through the malicious informations of discontented monks, who here, as in many monasteries of England at this time, served Crumwell as spies upon the acts and words of their superiors and brethren' (ii. 193). In connexion with this may be noted the fact, which appears in many of the bishops' injunctions, that wranglings and bitterness and quarrels were by no means unknown in many monasteries. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? A number of undisciplined and ignorant men, thrown together in the closest intercourse, and constantly subjected to the same vexatious rules, might naturally be expected to be somewhat inhar-

<sup>1</sup> Gasquet, ii. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *State Papers of Henry VIII.*, i. 537.

monious, and apt at tale-bearing and petty intrigues. To judge from the Injunctions this state of things was also not unknown in the nunneries. But there is really no case against the nuns on the ground of immorality. Out of the 140 convents of women at the time of the dissolution only twenty-seven nuns in all of them are charged with vice.<sup>1</sup> In the Norwich visitations only one nun is noted for a lapse. A worse case, indeed, than any in the visitors' reports is noted of the Convent of Littlemore in Bishop Attewell's visitation book. But these few cases prove nothing against the whole body, and the cruelty of ejecting these poor women, many of whom were aged and infirm, is something hideous and repulsive.

'The nun's lot,' writes Mr. Gasquet, 'had no such ray of consolation as that of the monk. Even had the circumstances attending her dismissal from conventional life been more fortunate, or the result of her own act or choice, her future must have been dark and uncertain, since the vows which bound her heart and conscience must keep her always apart from the secular surroundings in which she was compelled to exist' (ii. 203).

But amidst our earnest sympathy for the nuns we must not lose sight of common sense. When Mr. Gasquet dwells upon the blessing given to the country by the teaching of the nuns, it should be remembered that this 'teaching' was by no means provided for 'the youthful poor,' but for the daughters of great families, who came and dwelt in the nunneries, and paid the sisters handsomely. And when to 'the *bounty* of these religious ladies' it is said that a great number of secular clergy owed their position, as the 'titles' in the registers show, this is really a little too much. The monasteries, both male and female, had for centuries been filching from the secular clergy their lawful maintenance, had been acquiring appropriations of churches, which often, until compelled by the bishops to act otherwise, they had left without any pastoral care. The convents could, of course, in no case furnish this care of themselves. When, then, they appoint a chaplain, under episcopal threats, to minister in one of the churches whose tithes they had stolen, this is called their *bounty*!<sup>2</sup> We are compelled, by want of space, to pass over the chapter on the fall of the friars, once so popular in England, but long before their fall the objects of unmitigated satire and contempt; and also the extremely interesting chapter on the three Benedictine Abbots of Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester. That Mr. Gasquet

<sup>1</sup> Gasquet, ii. 205.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 221.

should feel deeply and write strongly on the cruelty and rapacity of the dissolution, the abominable desecration of holy things, and the horrors which were rampant everywhere, is only what was to be expected, and almost everyone will sympathize with him now. But this is no reason why he should make such absolutely unhistorical statements as the following :—

' Little by little the broad acres and ecclesiastical benefices, upon the revenues of which not only had the monks and nuns subsisted, but which had served to support the poor, aged and sick of the country, and for other public and national purposes, passed away into private hands without having contributed any substantial advantage to the country or crown, and unburdened by any condition of service to the commonwealth or particular district, which had hitherto characterized its tenure' (ii. 39<sup>2</sup>).

Upon this marvellous sentence we have to remark, first, that if the monks were living on the revenues of ecclesiastical benefices, they were living on that which they had obtained by robbery and injustice ; secondly, that they did not support the poor, aged and sick of the country, or how could such a state of things have existed as Sir T. More sketches in his *Utopia* (1516), or, as Mr. Gasquet himself has described in the earlier part of his work? thirdly, that the monks did almost absolutely nothing for 'public and national purposes,' but by engaging a number of able-bodied persons in a useless life, and being exempted from the ordinary taxation, thwarted and checked them ; fourthly, that it is not true that the monastic property when alienated did not contribute any substantial advantage to the country or crown, as Mr. Gasquet has himself shown in the next chapter ; fifthly, that it is absurd to say that the new holders were unburdened by any condition of service to the commonwealth, inasmuch as they were citizens subject to the ordinary laws and burdens of the State, from which the monks escaped. Mr. Gasquet no doubt can see no especial virtue in the character and spirit of the English country gentleman, which came out with such vigour in the next generation, scattering the feeble designs of popes and monks, Spanish armadas, and bulls of deposition ; but Englishmen are not likely to forget it, nor to fail to connect it very distinctly with the raising and strengthening of so many country families by the monastic lands.

We can admire very cordially this work. It is a monument of patient and careful research, it is admirably written, and for the most part eminently fair. But the general conclusions as to the value of monastic institutions, and as to the

mischief accruing to the country by their extinction, seem to us to be absolutely ludicrous. We have studied the history of many of these institutions, and what do we find to be the most familiar topics and incidents? Constant aggressions on their neighbours, constant law-suits, unceasing endeavours to get hold of advowsons and to farm churches, unscrupulous resistance to the bishops' visitations, and, in later times, utter disregard of their rules. That monasteries had done much good in their earlier days—that the Cistercians had improved land, the Benedictines preserved and executed many admirable manuscripts, the Carthusians exhibited a wonderful and constant asceticism and a very high tone of devotion, we don't deny. We utterly repudiate the slanders of the *Black Book* and the *Comptera*. We believe that the average rate of morality among monks and nuns was a fair one. But as to their usefulness, their value to the country, we are altogether at issue with their able defender. They were an absolute obstruction to all progress, and they needed to be removed. That this was done in so shocking a manner, and with so many circumstances of shame and horror, has no doubt tended to cause a strong reaction in their favour in these days, when the history of the reign of Henry VIII. may be said to have been opened for the first time. But to the calm judgment the main issue remains the same, however picturesque, romantic, and touching may be the details with which it is surrounded.

---

#### ART. VIII.—FARRAR'S LIVES OF THE FATHERS.

*Lives of the Fathers: Sketches of Church History in Biography.*

By FREDERIC W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., &c. 2 vols.  
(Edinburgh, 1889.)

ARCHDEACON FARRAR has certainly undertaken a work which is very much needed. He has undertaken—how far successfully it is the purpose of this article to inquire—to present to English readers in a popular form the results of all that modern scholarship has done towards investigating the growth of the Church and its institutions. He has chosen the biographical form, and he has been right in so doing; for however inadequate such a form may be for scientific history it is certainly the most popular amongst general readers. The interest which naturally attaches itself to personal life and char-

racter—and it is just in delineating and bringing out personal elements that this work is strongest—attracts many, who would not otherwise care for such things, to the not always inviting controversies of ecclesiastical history ; and some will be excited by the struggles of Athanasius, or admire the bold opposition of Chrysostom to a dissolute court, or the pathetic end of St. Augustine, dying while the province of Africa is overrun with barbarians and his own city is being besieged, who yet cannot understand Arianism, who feel doubtful of the great dangers of Origenism, and are willing to remain in ignorance about Manicheism, or the Donatists, or Pelagius. They feel exhilarated by the energy, the brightness, and the purifying influence which in spite of many dark spots mark the spread of Christianity : they are carried away by the glorious feeling of progress which marks the growth of the Church, and the heroism of its saints will make them realize the meaning of its teaching.

We shall find it necessary in the following pages to make somewhat severe criticisms on the work before us. It is the misfortune of the critic that he is always obliged to emphasize just those points on which he differs from the work he reviews ; it is only in general terms that he can, as a rule, point out its merits ; all the space at his command is devoted to illustrating and supporting his criticisms. We wish, therefore, in the most ungrudging manner possible, to express our admiration, in the first place, of the author's industry :—

'I have taken the best pains open to me, but I cannot hope to have escaped mistakes. To eliminate all possibility of errors and blemishes is hardly possible to any writer ; it is certainly not possible to one who, like myself, can only devote to authorship the too brief periods of holiday and the scant interspaces of leisure, which can alone be saved from the burden of heavy and pressing duties.'<sup>1</sup>

There can be no doubt that this book must have been written under circumstances in which a great effort of will and great industry were necessary to produce it. Archdeacon Farrar is rector of a large London parish, a canon of a collegiate church, and however circumscribed may be the limits of his archidiaconate, we presume it is not an absolute sinecure. That he is indefatigable in his attendance at public meetings, unwearied in preaching, a prominent member of Convocation, an untiring advocate of tempérance, even a slight acquaintance with the daily papers is sufficient to prove. All these varied duties must take up an immense amount of time, and be most exhausting to the brain of anyone ; yet

<sup>1</sup> Preface, p. xvii.

in spite of them Dr. Farrar has succeeded in producing a large number of works, all requiring, even if criticized from a hostile point of view, an immense amount of reading. We may wish sometimes that his vigorous mind had been more confined and more thorough in its work. We may deplore the fact that some of the books he has written show hastiness of execution and a want of appreciation of the difficulty of the subject he is attacking ; but we cannot withhold our admiration for his vigour of mind, for his industry, for his wide sphere of interest, and we could only wish that many of those who attack his writings, with whose opinions perhaps we agree much more than with his, showed some of the same devotion to learning in the midst of laborious parochial duties.

And in this quality will lie the merit of the book before us. We believe that it is not always well arranged, that it is sometimes not very clear ; we believe that it is occasionally inaccurate and often hastily written : that, through no fault of the writer, but through natural bias and a deficiency of the historic sense, it misrepresents the opinions of the Fathers ; but it bears abundant proof that Archdeacon Farrar has read them, and read them, if not carefully, at any rate widely. Many of their leading works are analyzed, and lengthy quotations are introduced, often, from a literary point of view, exceedingly well chosen. We may refer especially to the extracts from Tertullian (i. 242-4), and to the descriptions of the scenery of Pontus extracted from the works of Basil. As it is often said that in the ancient world there is little appreciation of scenery, as the feelings of the Christian hermit in seeking solitude in the most retired and lonely spots are often disputed, we feel justified in quoting the description based on Basil's letters of his retreat on the Iris, which proves that at least one Christian ascetic was influenced by the beauties of nature :—

‘ I started for Pontus to seek for life. There, indeed, God has shown me a spot which exactly suits my taste. . . . It is a lofty mountain overshadowed with a deep wood, irrigated on the north by cold and transparent streams. . . . The mountain range, with its moon-shaped windings, walls off the accessible parts of the plain. There is but one entrance of which we are the masters. My hut is built on another point, which uplifts a lofty tendon on the summit, so that this plain is outspread before the gaze, and from the height I can catch a glimpse of the river flowing round, which, to my fancy, affords no less delight than the view of the Strymon as you look from Amphiropolis. For the Strymon broadens into lakes with its more tranquil stream, and is so sluggish as almost to forfeit the character of a river. The Iris, on the other hand, flowing with a swifter course than any

river I  
then p  
delight  
ing the  
of fisher  
from th  
admire  
no time  
prolific  
for me

But w  
Gregor  
are gr  
more i

Of  
vigour  
works  
which  
rhetori  
the foun  
of the  
style is  
there v  
vigorou  
arrange  
whether  
Nor do  
chapter  
of heter  
order, a  
somewhe

But  
give an  
correct  
centuri  
siderabl  
to imply  
or very  
correctly  
reader,  
inaccura  
ourselve  
of know  
authorit  
himself

river I know, for a short space billows along the adjacent rocks, and then plunging over it rolls into a deep whirlpool, affording a most delightful view to me and to every spectator, and abundantly supplying the needs of the inhabitants, for it nurtures an incredible number of fishes in its eddies. Why need I tell you of the sweet exhalations from the earth, or the breezes from the river? Other persons might admire the multitude of the flowers or of the lyric birds, but I have no time to attend to them. But my highest eulogy of the spot is that, prolific as it is of all kinds of fruit from its happy situation, it bears for me the sweetest of all fruits—tranquillity' (i. 687-8).

But we must pass over the attractive correspondence between Gregory and Basil, and the many human touches which we are grateful to Dr. Farrar for having given us, for there are more important matters which will occupy much of our space.

Of the style we need say little. It has the energy and the vigour which mark the successful preacher, and, as in other works of the same author, it has the almost inevitable faults which are the natural result of an excessive devotion to rhetoric. It may be effective to describe a bishop's position in the fourth century as not being a 'bed of roses,' but the force of the expression is lost by repetition. After all, however, style is largely a question of taste, and we have no doubt that there will be many readers who will be attracted by the vigorously written and clear rhetorical passages. Defective arrangement is a more serious fault, and we are doubtful whether it is correct to put Clement and Origen after Cyprian. Nor do we think the arrangement of the different lives and chapters is always good. Occasionally a considerable amount of heterogeneous matter is collected together without much order, and the book gives the appearance of presenting the somewhat undigested contents of notebooks.

But a larger question remains behind. Does the book give an adequate account of the lives of the Fathers and a correct representation of the Church life of the first four centuries? Now, although, as we shall see, there are a considerable number of inaccurate statements, we do not mean to imply that the work is a mere tissue of blunders; the best or very fair authorities are generally followed, and followed correctly; the facts, from the point of view of a general reader, are not misleading; but in a scholarly aspect these inaccuracies are so important that we are tempted to ask ourselves whether Archdeacon Farrar has that thoroughness of knowledge which would entitle him to be considered as an authority. Particularly when he becomes rhetorical he allows himself to make statements which are contradicted in other

parts of the book, while his prejudices make him give an impression often wholly incorrect of the opinions of the Fathers on many important theological questions.

We shall begin with pointing out a certain number of these inaccuracies. On p. xx is a list of the Bishops of Rome, which professes to give two alternative systems of chronology ; the first column is taken from Jaffé, the second from a person called Gaius (Gams is meant). If we refer to the original authority, we shall see that up to the time of Mark (336–337) the second column gives the dates of the death, not the accession, of the bishops ; after that date both columns give the dates of accession. In whatever way this mistake arose, it implies exceedingly careless work. But this is not all ; on pages xxi to xxv is a general chronological table. Sixtus I., Pope, is there put down to the date c. 109 A.D. ; the dates given in the previous table are 119 and 126. Under the date c. 151 we are told that Polycarp visits Anicetus at Rome, but in the previous table the dates ascribed to the episcopacy of Anicetus are 157 and 167 in the two columns, with neither of which is the date ascribed to the visit of Polycarp consistent. In vol. ii. p. 707 seq. are notes on the early Bishops of Rome. Here some further alternatives are given the reader. Linus is ascribed to 62, in the tables to 67 and 79 ; Sixtus, again, to 109 ; and Dionysius to 269, the last two being probably misprints ; there are one or two minor inaccuracies we need not notice. Now an excuse is attempted for this : ‘In some cases where the date is uncertain the dates here given may not always correspond exactly with those in the text. To decide many of the dates with perfect accuracy is an impossible task’ (i. p. xxi note). This last statement is perfectly true, but it does not excuse inconsistency and inaccuracy ; it is not a matter of much importance which system is adopted, but it is obvious that it is necessary to be consistent, otherwise perpetual confusion will be introduced. The relative dates of two events are often known when the absolute dates are uncertain ; for instance, the fact that Polycarp visited Rome when Anicetus was bishop may be looked upon as certain, although the exact year in which this occurred may be doubtful ; but if alternative systems of chronology are adopted this synchronism is obscured.

The ‘Notes’ at the end of the second volume contain a considerable number of incorrect statements. Clement of Rome, he says, ‘is the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians, known only through the Alexandrian MS. presented by Cyril Lucar to Charles I. in 1625. A second epistle was

discover  
fragme  
as the t  
passage  
hardly  
both th  
the first  
that Bri  
been ki  
250 year  
Constant  
Nor is i  
as a m  
homiliat  
emanati

On  
heretics  
heretics  
tians.  
Christia  
one is a  
idealism  
are corre  
is, on th  
where w  
and the  
Christian  
(i. 355).  
expressio  
in the on  
opposed  
Nazaren  
yet ther  
bodies an  
Christian  
mind wh  
strongly  
We shou  
716), he  
vn.

The  
instances  
is devote  
tury, and  
theologia

discovered by Bishop Bryennios in 1875, but is in reality a fragment of a very ordinary homily, and is as little genuine as the two encyclical letters on virginity,' &c. (ii. 708). This passage is a curious collection of misstatements; we need hardly remind our readers that the Alexandrine MS. contains both the first and the so-called second epistle of Clement, that the first epistle is contained also in the manuscript of Bryennios, that Bryennios did not discover the second epistle, which had been known (although in not quite a perfect condition) for 250 years, and that since his discovery of the manuscript at Constantinople it can no longer be described as a fragment. Nor is it correct to describe it as a very ordinary homily, for, as a matter of fact, it is the earliest or one of the earliest homilies preserved to us, and is in any case a document emanating from the Christian Church at a very early period.

On p. 716 we find the following statements about the heretics of the first century: 'The Nazarenes were hardly heretics, but a marked type of narrow and Judaizing Christians. Ebionism is a particularistic contraction of the Christian religion; Gnosticism a vague expansion of it. The one is a gross literalism and realism; the other a fantastic idealism and spiritualism,' &c. (ii. 716). All these statements are correct, and the contrast between the two forms of heresy is, on the whole, well drawn out. Why then does he elsewhere write: 'There were Jewish Gnostics like the Ebionites and the pupils of Cerinthus. . . . There were Gnostics whose Christianity was a feeble graft on Judaism, like the Nazarenes' (i. 355). Surely it is unwise, to say the least, to use such an expression as Gnostic in two such very different senses, that in the one case it includes Ebionism, and in the other is directly opposed to it; and although it is true that under the name of Nazarenes both a Jewish and a Christian sect are included, yet there is no evidence that in these two passages different bodies are referred to. In both cases it is obvious that the Christian sect is meant, and Dr. Farrar ought to make up his mind whether the Nazarenes were 'hardly heretics,' or so strongly Judaic that their Christianity was only a feeble graft. We should like to know also how, in the same passage (ii. 716), he manages to derive the word Ebion from the Hebrew עבון.

The pages which follow this curious information contain instances of extremely inadequate arrangement. A section is devoted to the Gnostics of Asia Minor in the second century, and among them is placed Lucian, the Antiochene theologian, whose date is correctly given, 311, between Marius

and his pupil Apelles. To accuse Lucian of Gnosticism is strange. Shortly after, a list of heretics, not directly Gnostic, in the second and third centuries is given, and under this head are included Macedonius and Apollinaris. This again is only a case of defective arrangement, but it may confuse ignorant readers (ii. 717-20).

We have noticed several cases in which we find Dr. Farrar contradicting himself: for instance, in his account of Montanism (the whole of which seems to us most unsatisfactory), in one place where he is enumerating the false charges against it, which he calls the 'frothy and burning venom of unchristian hatred,' he says, 'In the case of Montanus the slanders collide with each other. While Isidore charges him with being a debauchee, Jerome taunts him with being a eunuch (*abscissus* and *semivir*)' (i. 181). The context makes it clear that we are to suppose this last charge is a slander, and that the author of it is to be condemned for circulating it. But seven pages further on Dr. Farrar seems almost to adopt it. Montanism, he tells us, 'originated in Phrygia, the hotbed of wild nature worship, the natural outcome of temperaments nurtured in a land of drought, deluges, and earthquakes. According to one story, Montanus himself, before his conversion to Christianity, had been a mutilated priest of Cybele, familiar with the orgiastic practices of her frenzied worship' (i. 188). Which is the correct opinion we are not prepared to assert dogmatically; what we wish now to emphasize is the facility with which Dr. Farrar's view of facts varies to suit his theories; and we believe that in the passage just quoted Dr. Farrar gives a much more correct account of the origin of Montanism than when he says, 'It is beginning to be widely recognized that in many of its aspects Montanism was an honest and earnest endeavour to restore the discipline and the practices of primitive Christianity' (i. 183). He goes on to call it an earnest and well-meaning reaction against Gnostic rationalism and Catholic laxity. There is great difficulty involved in the chronology of Montanism; but as he adopts, or seems to adopt, the date 130 (i. 180 n. 1), it is difficult to understand how it could be a reaction against Gnosticism, which, in any developed form, only began about that period. Nor have we any evidence that the Church of Asia at the beginning of the second century suffered from the moral laxity which distinguished the Church of Rome a century later, and to which Dr. Farrar appeals (i. 183) in support of his statement. The real cause of the confusion is that the Montanism of Tertullian is confused with that of Asia. There-

can b  
in his  
him v  
In its  
planat  
orgias  
was an  
fashio  
and it  
sembla  
Paul r

W  
Dr. F  
help t  
unhist  
stated  
contro  
contro  
dogma  
by opp  
Farrar  
and an

Of  
spirit  
the life

' W  
in the  
stolic e  
teachin  
ears, a  
what ti  
and wo  
standing  
stories  
dispositi

Now,  
we wo  
first-bo  
nothing  
against  
Whom  
tenden  
must r  
and fa

can be no doubt that the disciplinary laxity of the Church in his time made Tertullian a Montanist, but Montanism in him was probably much coloured by his own individuality. In its earlier period the place of its origin makes the explanation adopted by Canon Farrar, of the influence of the orgiastic Phrygian worship, the most probable. Montanism was an outburst of undisciplined spiritual zeal, which it is the fashion to call nowadays an assertion of spiritual freedom, and its only connexion with primitive Christianity was a resemblance to the undisciplined spiritual exaltation which St. Paul rebukes in the first Epistle to the Corinthians.

We have, we hope, given enough instances to prove that Dr. Farrar is not always accurate. A worse fault, we cannot help thinking, in his book is its extremely controversial and unhistorical spirit. We may be thought unreasonable in this statement, for there is nothing that it attacks so much as the controversial spirit; but it is possible to attack theological controversy in an extremely controversial spirit, to rebuke dogma in a dogmatic manner, to show a spirit of intolerance by opposing want of toleration. But, more than this, Dr. Farrar holds certain views very strongly and dogmatically, and any opposition to these he cannot endure.

Of his opposition to what he considers the controversial spirit many instances might be given. We will take one from the life of Polycarp:—

'What follows gives us a less attractive picture. "I can testify in the sight of God," says Irenæus, "that if that blessed and apostolic elder had heard anything of this kind" (alluding to the novel teaching of Florinus), "he would have cried out and stopped his ears, and would have said, after his wont, 'O good God, for what times hast Thou kept me that I should endure these things?' and would have fled from the very place where he was sitting or standing when he heard such words." . . . Irenæus is fonder of stories of this kind than we should have expected from his pacific disposition' (i. 78).

Now, we are quite willing to agree with Dr. Farrar that we would rather that Polycarp had not called Marcion the first-born of Satan; but surely the story just quoted shows nothing but the natural and proper resentment of an old man against opinions which denied his redemption by the Lord for Whom he would soon lay down his life, and involved immoral tendencies against which all his moral and spiritual nature must revolt. Similarly, we quite agree that the personalities and false accusations which stained controversy were disas-

trous, but is it wise to be so extremely vehement in rebuking a vehement tendency?

We might illustrate his unhistorical method of treating the period, from the somewhat naïve manner in which he rebukes Augustine for his ignorance of political economy (ii. 474, 475), or from his habit of quoting the Thirty-nine Articles against the Fathers (i. 265, 306, 383, 725); we prefer rather to touch on his treatment of monasticism, and we do so because we agree with him to a large extent. We believe with him that there was an oriental and Manichaean tendency which permeated the thoughts of many of those who protested against the heresy of that name; we agree with him that experience has shown that the compulsory celibacy of the clergy is an evil; we think he is correct in pointing out the disastrous results which monasticism and extravagant asceticism often produce; but in spite of this we feel obliged to protest against the manner in which he treats the whole ascetic movement of the fourth and fifth centuries. The subject constantly recurs, but a whole section (ii. 215-33) in the life of Jerome is devoted to it, and may be looked upon as a formal statement of Dr. Farrar's views of the most striking movement of the period. In that chapter, after a short introduction, he points out the existence of asceticism among various barbarous tribes; he then discusses its origin, which he ascribes entirely to dualistic tendencies; the remainder of the section is devoted to pointing out the evils it caused. Of its good influence nothing is said at all, but his own pages give us plenty of material for forming a more philosophic opinion on the subject. Was there nothing but evil in a movement which was supported by every great saint of the period? Its spread through Europe and Asia is connected with the names of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, of St. Jerome and St. Augustine, of St. Ambrose and St. Martin of Tours, who stand out conspicuously for their moral strength and saintly lives. If we ask what was the state of the world, do not the brilliant rhetorical descriptions which the book before us contains of Rome when Jerome was preaching virginity, or of Constantinople when Chrysostom was thundering against the vices of the court, make us feel that a moral reaction however one-sided was not only beneficial but necessary? When we remember, too, that it was not merely the world but the Church that was being corrupted, when we remember the pictures which are drawn for us of the worldly priest of the fourth century, when we read of the more insidious attacks of heathenism within the Church, and remember how slow the process of changing

human  
the fi  
mona  
for th  
conqu  
mona  
Gwat  
mona  
of N  
lost s  
world  
is nev  
indep  
tempt  
his no  
up th  
suffer  
pende  
unhan  
depen  
ambit  
promi  
of a n  
tion.  
of ec  
for hi  
a bish  
No  
to me  
more :  
good s  
  
In  
deeply,  
selfishn  
to what  
men ha  
and ma  
was no  
riches h  
labour  
more th  
dignitat  
abstaine  
that "t  
and wo  
forms, t

human nature is, we feel that the moral strength gained by the freedom, independence, and abnegation of the world which monasticism had produced was, humanly speaking, necessary for the preservation of the Christianity which seemed to have conquered. Why is so much said about the heresies that monasticism originated, and nothing of the fact which both Gwatkin and Harnack dwell upon, that the development of monasticism was one of the ultimate causes of the triumph of Nicene orthodoxy? Why are we told that Chrysostom lost so much in temper and judgment and knowledge of the world by his ascetic training (which may be true), while it is never hinted that it may have given him the strength and independence which enabled him to remain firm amid both temptation and opposition? How, too, could Basil have made his noble answer to the eunuch of Valens if he had not given up the world? How could he have been so callous to bodily suffering if he had not already disciplined his body, or independent of earthly possessions if he had not sacrificed them, or unhampered by worldly ties if he had had a wife or children dependent upon him for support? We hear much of the ambition, the intrigues, the worldly pride which disgraced prominent ecclesiastics, and which so often made the election of a new bishop a scene of disorder and a contest of corruption. Why is not one word of praise given to the one body of ecclesiastics of the day who showed an absolute contempt for hierarchical position and with whom the dislike of being a bishop was a real sentiment?

No one can accuse Mr. Lecky of an extravagant devotion to monks. He makes all the charges of Dr. Farrar with more strength if less vehemence; but he is not blind to the good side of the institution.

' Imperfect and distorted as was the ideal of the anchorite—deeply, too, as it was perverted by the admixture of a spiritual selfishness—still the example of many thousands, who, in obedience to what they believed to be right, voluntarily gave up everything that men hold dear, cast to the winds every compromise with enjoyment, and made extreme self-abnegation the very principle of their lives, was not wholly lost upon the world. At a time when increasing riches had profoundly tainted the Church they taught men "to love labour more than rest, and ignominy more than glory, and to give more than to receive." At a time when the passion for ecclesiastical dignities had become the scandal of the empire, they systematically abstained from them, teaching, in their quaint but energetic language, that "there are two classes a monk should especially avoid—bishops and women." The very eccentricities of their lives, their uncouth forms, their horrible penances, were the admiration of rude men, and

the superstitious reverence thus excited gradually passed to the charity and the self-denial which formed the higher elements of the monastic character.<sup>1</sup>

Now we do not doubt that Dr. Farrar would admit all this and much more. We do not deny the evils of which he complains. What we feel is that he has dwelt upon one side to a much greater extent than on the other, that he has urged the failures with such rhetorical force, that his language is often unrestrained, that he completely fails to take an historical as opposed to a controversial view, and consequently largely misrepresents the whole history of the period.

But he is not only a controversialist, he occasionally shows that he does not possess any clear grasp of scientific theology. We do not mean merely that he holds views upon which we differ from him, but that he shows signs of not understanding clearly the subject he is writing about. In discussing the theology of St. Augustine he says:—

‘The doctrine of endless torments for all but the few, to which he first gave fixity in opposition to the opinion then prevalent even in the Western Church, has ever been confronted by God’s revelation of Himself as a God of love to the individual soul. Semi-Pelagianism, in spite of his arguments, has been and is the general doctrine of the Christian Church’ (ii. 604, 605).

In support of this last statement he refers to Bright’s *Anti-Pelagian Treatises* (p. lxiv.). When we turn to the passage referred to, we find that Dr. Bright, as we might expect, says something very different. He is discussing the Council of Orange, he is emphasizing the great claim that council has to the gratitude of future generations of Christians, and shows how its decisions have received the assent of the Church and become part of the Church’s doctrinal system. And the reasons for our gratitude are (1) that it condemned both Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism; (2) that it condemned an extreme view of predestination. The following extracts will prove this:—

‘The first two articles simply affirm the doctrine of the Fall as against Pelagianism, to the effect that through Adam’s sin man’s whole being was changed for the worse, and not only death but sin was transmitted to his posterity. Then follow six articles directed against semi-Pelagianism, and insisting on grace as an invariable antecedent to all goodness.’

<sup>1</sup> Lecky, *History of European Morals*, ii. 164.

He t  
is att‘And  
unhap  
compi  
baptis  
to wo  
are a  
nounc  
are p  
imme  
gianis  
baptisMore  
collec  
condonN  
ingly  
refers  
secon  
he d  
extra  
mean  
the h  
so do  
show  
views  
was e  
remoA  
Irena  
Nazia  
that h  
of Ire  
of the  
ranso  
passa  
remain  
of his  
affecti  
thought  
v. I. I  
which  
Baur,  
passa

He then goes on to describe the points in which St. Augustine is attacked :—

'And then the Council's formulary turns, with a breadth of view unhappily absent from Augustine's Predestinarian writings, to the complementary truth that, "according to the Catholic faith, all the baptized are capable, by Christ's aid and co-operation, if they choose to work faithfully, of fulfilling the conditions of eternal salvation," and are accordingly "bound" to fulfil them ; and an anathema is pronounced against those, "if any there be, who hold that any persons are predestined to evil by Divine power." . . . Returning to their immediate object, the bishops repeat their condemnation of semi-Pelagianism by affirming that faith and love, as well before baptism as after baptism, are the results of God's inspiration.'

More than this, Dr. Bright points out how the language of collects used in the Church of England services is an implicit condemnation of semi-Pelagianism.

Now two things become obvious. The first is the exceedingly untrustworthy character of Dr. Farrar's references. He refers to passages which he has not read properly. And the second point is that the cause of his mistake is obviously that he does not clearly understand the question at issue. The extract that we have given above makes it clear that what he meant to say was that the Church has condemned or modified the harsher forms of Augustinianism, and he imagines that by so doing the Church accepted semi-Pelagianism. Dr. Bright shows that, by separating the Church teaching from the rigid views with which it had been confused, the Council of Orange was enabled effectually to condemn semi-Pelagianism and to remove the difficulties of many believers.

An inconsistency in his treatment of the theology of Irenæus is perhaps worth mentioning. Referring to Gregory Nazianzus he says : 'It is highly to the credit of his insight that he was one of the few theologians who, between the days of Irenæus and those of Anselm, rejected that hideous theory of the Atonement which represented the blood of Christ as *a ransom paid to Satan*' (i. 774). The obvious deduction from this passage is that Irenæus did not say so ; but if we turn to the remarks on the views of Irenæus we read in a note, 'Some of his opinions about the manner in which the Atonement affected the dealings of God and Satan were peculiar. He thought that the *ransom* of man was made to the devil (*Hær. v. i. 1*)' (i. 100). Now, we are not concerned with the question which is the right view (the last statement has the authority of Baur, who is quoted, and of Lipsius, but is based on an isolated passage). What is noticeable is this : that in one passage Dr.

Farrar implies that Irenæus does not hold an opinion which in another place he says he does ; and in one place he calls an opinion strange which in another place he says was held by almost every theologian between Irenæus and Anselm. We wonder how many authors and how many recensions in the work before us an acute German critic would discover.

So far we have confined ourselves to purely uncontroversial points, and we have done so purposely. We have shown that Dr. Farrar is occasionally extremely inaccurate, that he misquotes rather seriously, that he is at times violently controversial, and that he has an inadequate grasp of theological questions. The instances we have given are by no means the only ones we have noted, and have been discovered without searching for them with any great trouble. We pass now to points on which so much difference of opinion has prevailed that we do not intend dogmatically to assert our own views. On all ecclesiastical matters Dr. Farrar differs widely from us, and although we think his views erroneous, we wish to treat them as fairly as possible ; at the same time we feel that not only is Dr. Farrar wrong, but that he also seriously misrepresents the Fathers, and that his want of sympathy with them prevents him from adequately representing their views to modern readers. We would gladly avoid controversy, but Dr. Farrar by his extremely controversial attitude compels us to meet him.

The points we refer to are (1) the Church, (2) tradition, (3) episcopacy, (4) the authority of the Fathers.

On the Church the propositions asserted by Dr. Farrar are the following : that a large section of the Fathers of the early Church believed in what he calls the Invisible Church ; that those who did not, who are responsible for building up the ecclesiastical system, held cruel and hideous views which demand severe censure ; that they put the ecclesiastical system in the place of Christ, and limit the operations of the Holy Spirit. He speaks of

'narrow, untenable, and pernicious views of the Church, of Catholicity' (ii. 500). 'It is the Church, not the living Christ, which becomes in the Augustinian system the one Mediator between God and man' (ii. 600). 'Of the true nature of the Church Augustine had a very narrow conception. He confounded the *Church mainly with the clergy*, and dwarfed the ideal of Christ into the founder of the dwindled Church instead of the Saviour of mankind' (ii. 602). 'It was a Church represented almost exclusively by a sacerdotal caste, devoted to the aggrandisement of its own power, cut off by celibacy from ordinary human interests, armed with fearful

spirit  
which  
Augu  
archy

W  
pose  
Augu  
almost  
and e  
the d  
the w  
the F  
tion the  
not d  
mean  
Churc  
within  
the m  
ordain  
side c

It  
will c  
broug  
Fath  
refer  
belief  
Churc  
right t  
right  
The r  
failing  
censu  
a mat  
and if  
passag  
the op

et univ  
omes,  
per sem  
et Spiri  
Spiritu  
visible  
Spirit,  
the gra

spiritual weapons, and possessing the sole right to administer a grace which came magically through none but mechanical channels. . . . Augustine substituted an organised Church and a supernatural hierarchy for an ever-present Christ' (ii. 603).

We might quote much more of this if there was any purpose in so doing. Some of the allegations, such as that Augustine identified the Church mainly with the clergy, are almost ludicrous. The more important statements made here and elsewhere we shall rebut under the following heads: 1. That the doctrine of an invisible Church in the Protestant sense of the word was never held by any of the early Fathers. 2. That the Fathers did not limit the divine grace or hopes of salvation hereafter to those within the Church; even Augustine, the harsher side of whose theology has been condemned, did not do so. 3. That the doctrine '*nulla salus extra ecclesiam*' means therefore, as Origen holds it to mean, that within the Church only is the safety and assurance gained of being within the covenant of God's mercy. 4. That the Church is the means to lead man to Christ, and for a man to desert the ordained channels of Christ's grace is to refuse to fulfil his side of the covenant.

It is difficult to prove within a short space a negative. We will content ourselves with examining some of the instances brought forward of the theory of an invisible Church in the Fathers. We presume that this is the meaning of the following reference to Irenæus. 'But Montanus and Tertullian spoke the beliefs of multitudes when they argued that an unprogressive Church must of necessity be a dead Church . . . that if it were right to say with Irenæus, "Ubi ecclesia ibi spiritus," it was also right to add with him, "Et ubi spiritus ibi ecclesia"' (i. 184). The reference given is simply 'Iren.' We think we should be failing in our duties as critic if we did not express some censure at such an extremely careless mode of citation. As a matter of fact the reference is Iren. iii. 38. 1 (ed. Harvey), and if the reader will refer to the context, he will see that the passage means not that there is a spiritual Church, but that the operations of the Spirit are confined to the Church.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'In ecclesia enim, inquit, posuit Deus apostolos, prophetas, doctores, et universam reliquam operationem Spiritus; cuius non sunt particeps omnes, qui non concurrunt ad Ecclesiam, sed semetipsos fraudant a vita, per sententiam malam, et operationem pessimam. Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illuc Ecclesia, et omnis gratia: Spiritus autem veritas.'—Iren. iii. 38. 1 (ed. Harvey). It is obvious that a visible Church is referred to which is the sphere of the operation of the Spirit, and that the persons condemned are those who deliberately reject the grace offered them. Dr. Farrar, we find, quotes the passage else-

We will pass to Clement. Clement, we are told, 'taught further that the Church means all who are in Christ' (i. 389). What this exactly means we do not know, but we presume it must be explained by another passage.

'There are very few of the Christian Fathers whose fundamental conceptions are better suited to correct the narrowness, the rigidity, and the formalism of Latin theology. He views Christianity from the standpoint of humanity and not from the standpoint of party; he regards it as a life, not as an organization, as a germinant principle of truth, not as a rigid deposit of formulæ' (i. 388).

In other words, we imagine that what he means is that Clement looked upon the Church not as a visible body bound together by external signs, but as an invisible company of believers some of whom were nominally Christians and some not.

He quotes concerning the Church two passages. The first is *Strom.* vii. 17, § 107. In this we can find only one sentence which could possibly be quoted to favour his idea. 'From what has been said, then, it is, I think, clear that the true Church, that which is really ancient, is one, and into it those who are ordained to be just are enrolled, just as God is one and the Lord one.'<sup>1</sup> This means, not that the Church consists of all who are just, but that all who are just, that is, preordained to fulfil His will on earth, are collected into the Church. If any deduction could be drawn on the point in question, it would be that there are no δίκαιοι outside the Church.

This is the only statement in the section which in any way bears on the point he discusses, but we learn a great deal more about the Church as Clement conceives it. We learn that it must be one—one in substance, in conception, in origin, in excellence. It is one as God is one, and the fault of the sects is that they attempt to divide it. How can an invisible body, a body which is not organized, which is only 'those that believe in Christ,' be capable of division?<sup>2</sup>

where (i. 340) with the reference, and shows clearly that he uses it with the meaning we had supposed.

<sup>1</sup> ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀρά φανερὸν οἷμαι γεγενῆσθαι μίαν εἶνα τὴν ἀληθῆ ἐκκλησίαν τὴν τῷ ὅντι ἀρχαῖαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν δίκαιοι ἔγκαταλέγονται, ἐνὸς γάρ ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου.—Clem. A. *Strom.* vii. 17, § 107. We have translated according to the punctuation of our edition, which is obviously wrong; the last clause belongs to the following sentence.

<sup>2</sup> τῇ γοῦν τοῦ ἐνὸς φύσει συγκληρούται ἐκκλησία ἡ μία, ἣν εἰς πολλὰς κατέμενεν βιβλίοντα αἱρέσεις, κατά τε οὖν ὑπόστασιν κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν, κατά τε ἀρχὴν κατά τε ἔξοχην μόνην εἶναι φανερὴν ἀρχαῖαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. . . . συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἥδη κατατεταγμένους ὃς πρώτησεν ὁ Θεὸς δικαίους ἐσφένεν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνώκως.—*ibid.* It is strange that this is exactly the section which Mr. Gore in his book on the Christian ministry quotes in support

The second passage referred to is in the *Pædagogus*, and here we must again complain of an inadequate reference. In a chapter of twenty-two pages (in our edition), which is divided into sections, surely a more accurate reference than *Pæd.* i. 6 might be given. When we turn to the chapter, we find that the greater part is devoted to proving, in opposition to the Gnostics, the efficacy of baptism—that it alone is necessary to enable all men alike to attain the full perfection of Christian graces. We have found in it only three references to the Church. In one (§ 27) we are told that not the higher elevation of the Gnostic is required for salvation, but merely to believe and be born again is perfection in life. Christ's purpose is the salvation of men, and this is called the Church. The meaning of the passage being that to be members of the Church, which he calls in the same chapter the Virgin Mother (§ 42), and which he elsewhere describes as growing as a man grows (§ 38), only baptism and faith are required. There is nothing in the chapter which hints that Clement had in view a spiritual Church.

On Clement's views as a whole we may refer to what Dr. Bigg,<sup>1</sup> who cannot be accused of a bias in favour of ecclesiasticism, and Mr. Gore<sup>2</sup> say, only pointing out that such phrases as ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδωσις<sup>3</sup> and ἐκκλησιαστικὴ γνῶσις<sup>4</sup> are meaningless unless referring to a body with a concrete existence.

We have not sufficient space to justify at length our assertion that the Fathers never conceived the idea of an invisible Church. We have, we think, proved that Dr. Farrar's assertions are not always justified by the passages he refers to. We refer the reader to the authorities mentioned in our notes,<sup>5</sup>

of his contention that Clement taught the doctrine of a visible Church. Perhaps Dr. Farrar means the same. We must apologize if we have interpreted his somewhat vague language incorrectly. Between what we conceive to be his interpretation of the passage and Mr. Gore's, we must leave any fair-minded reader who will look at the passage to judge. See Gore, *The Ministry of the Christian Church*, pp. 25, 26.

<sup>1</sup> Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 99, 100.

<sup>2</sup> Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, pp. 25, 26.

<sup>3</sup> vii. 16, § 95.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* § 97.  
<sup>5</sup> On this subject see Gore, chap. i., especially pp. 19–30; Rothe, *Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung*, p. 618: ‘Die Unterscheidung des Origenes zwischen der eigentlich und der nur uneigentlich so zu nennenden Kirche ist im Wesentlichen schon die Unterscheidung Augustins zwischen den Corpus Christi verum und dem Corpus Christi simulatum. Nur ist die bei dem Origenes noch ziemlich verhüllte Vorstellung bei dem Augustinus zu völliger Klarheit durchgearbeitet. Weder des Origenes κυρίως ἐκκλησίᾳ noch des Augustinus Corpus Christi verum fällt aber mit der unsichtbaren Kirche der Protestanten zusammen.’ We owe the reference to Mr. Gore's book. Rothe was a Lutheran.

and will pass on to the second point of our subject, the statement that, however exaggerated and harsh some of the statements in the Fathers may seem, they did not condemn all without the Church to eternal punishment.

The condemnation of Augustine's theology by Dr. Farrar is extremely severe. It is a theology which has not been accepted by the Church in every point. But the following passages will show a side of it which ought to be emphasized. In one of his letters he is discussing the difficulty raised by Porphyry—if Christ has been the only way to salvation, what has been the fate of all those generations of men who lived before He came? And he lays down the following principles: That from the beginning to the end of time all things are inspired by the Word of God; that from the beginning of the world all who have believed on Him, *however they have understood Him*, are undoubtedly saved by Him; that the same religion has been known at one time in one way, at another in another, and that sacraments may have varied; that although it is conceivable that He may have known that there would be none who would believe in Him where the Gospel has not been preached, yet, as we know that there were those in the past outside the covenant who were inspired by His Word, the same is possible in other places and circumstances; and he concludes with the words, 'So the salvation of Christianity has never been wanting to anyone who was worthy of it; and anyone who has been without it, has not been worthy of it.'<sup>1</sup> Inadequate these views may be, tinged as they are with St. Augustine's extreme predestinarian teaching, but they show that his teaching had a side which the exaggerated attacks of Dr. Farrar entirely obscure.

But what, then, is the meaning of 'Nulla salus extra ecclesiam'?<sup>2</sup> Dr. Farrar points out that it was used by Origen, but

<sup>1</sup> Augustine, *Ep.* cii. § 12: 'Ab exordio generis humani quicunque in eum crediderunt, eumque utcunq; intelleixerunt, et secundum ejus præcepta pie et juste vixerunt, quondolibet et ubilibet fuerint, per eum procul dubio salvi facti sunt . . . nec quia una eademque res, aliis atque aliis sacris et sacramentis vel prædicatur aut prophetatur, ideo alias atque alias res, vel alias atque alias salutes oportet intelligi. . . . § 15. Ita salus religionis hujus, per quam solam veram salutem vera veraciterque promittitur, nulli unquam defuit qui dignus fuit, et cui defuit dignus non fuit.' On the whole subject cf. Reuter, *Augustinische Studien*, I., II., especially pp. 88, 96.

<sup>2</sup> These exact words, though attributed to St. Cyprian by Dr. Farrar (i. 340), are not to be found in the text of any of the works of any of the Fathers. Their equivalent, we readily admit, is not uncommon. See Origen in *Lib. Jesu Nave Hom.* iii. 5 (a passage which we shall quote in a subsequent note); St. Augustine, *Sermo ad Cæsarensis Eccl. plebem*, 6; St. Cyprian, *Epp.* lxii. lxxiii. The words do, however, occur in the index

ascrib  
of A  
Chur  
see th  
as St  
usual  
the b  
the w  
into t  
of thi  
mean  
afterw  
admin  
repea  
the C  
means  
What  
idea m  
moniz  
some :  
all th  
have s  
the Ch  
and al  
too ste  
had ne  
that G  
We  
to the B  
find 'nul  
*De Unit*  
to St. G  
universa  
in the pa  
<sup>1</sup> Ori  
salus nis  
sanguis  
semetips  
salvatur  
quae alio  
sancto,  
Westcott  
does not  
*Bampton*  
est, nequ  
reservatu  
interpret  
VOL.

ascribes to his use of the expression a different sense from that of Augustine, presuming that Origen means an invisible Church. If we turn to the passage where it occurs, we shall see that obviously he uses the word 'Church' in the same sense as St. Augustine. Origen is commenting on Rahab, and as usual finds an allegorical meaning. Salvation comes through the blood of Christ, *i.e.* the red cord, but it is hung up in the window of that house which is the Church, as a sign that into this house all who wish to be saved must come, for out of this house, that is the Church, no one is saved. What is meant is made quite clear by a reference to baptism shortly afterwards.<sup>1</sup> Now we have no wish to put forward this as admirable exegesis, and we sincerely hope that no one will repeat it at the present day; but what Origen conceives by the Church is quite clear. It is exactly what Augustine means, a visible body, entrance into which brings salvation. What, then, is salvation? It is that feeling of assurance which is gained by being within God's covenant. Some such idea must have been in Origen's mind to enable him to harmonize his teaching with his known eschatological views, and some such view would have been in St. Augustine's mind. To all those who neglected this opportunity of salvation he would have said, as Origen said, 'Whosoever goes out of the doors of the Church, he is guilty of his own death.' Against all heretics and all who neglected the grace offered them he was stern—too stern—in his denunciations; but of those unbaptized, who had never been offered baptism, he might say, as he implies, that God could save them in His own way.

We have attempted to show that, although they bring out

to the Benedictine edition of St. Cyprian's works (Paris, 1726), where we find 'nulla salus extra ecclesiam, p. 195.' The reference is to the treatise *De Unitate Ecclesiae*; but the words are not found therein. In the index to St. Gregory the Great's works the words also occur, 'extra sanctam et universalem Ecclesiam nulla est salus, p. 437.' But they are not to be found in the passage referred to, though they represent St. Gregory's meaning.

<sup>1</sup> Origen in *Lib. Iesu Nave Hom.* iii. 5: 'Sciebat enim quia nulli esset salus nisi in sanguine Christi. . . . Ad hanc veniat domum in qua Christi sanguis in signo redēctionis est. . . . Nemo ergo sibi persuadeat, nemo semetipsum decipiāt: extra hanc domum, id est, extra ecclesiam, nemo salvatur. . . . quo signo salutem consequantur omnes, qui in domo ejus, quae aliquando erat meretrix, fuerint inventi, mundati in aqua et Spiritu sancto, et in sanguine Domini et Salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi.' Dr. Westcott seems to interpret this of the invisible Church, but the context does not support such an explanation. A passage quoted by Bigg, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 223 (*In Jer. Hom.* xx. 3: 'Qui contra ecclesiam est, neque vas misericordiae est neque irae . . . sed vas in aliud quiddam reservatum'), seems to show that the meaning of 'salus' is the key to the interpretation of the passage quoted above.

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII.

E E

different points in different degrees, there is among the Fathers of the early Church a general agreement in believing in a visible Church, in looking on it as the means by which man receives salvation,<sup>1</sup> in condemning those who neglect its teaching, who go out from its gates, who divide it by schism, or corrupt its teaching by heresy. This is their agreement. The eschatological speculations of Origen, on the harsher side of Augustinianism, are individual opinions, and we should cordially endorse some of Dr. Farrar's remarks on the latter point, if they had been expressed in a less vehement manner, and if he had not confused with them an attack on the doctrine of that Church in which we express our belief in the Creed, and on the ordinances of that Church which our Prayer-Book bids us accept.

Akin to the doctrine of the Church is the subject of tradition, and on this subject again Dr. Farrar not only disagrees from, but, as we believe, also misrepresents the writers whom he criticizes. The subject he naturally discusses in the life of Irenæus, but he refers to it elsewhere (i. 103, 725). He makes, as far as we can gather, three complaints:—

(1) 'That Irenæus appeals to tradition in support of facts which are now universally rejected, and of stories which contain very dubious elements.' As an instance he refers to the assertion that our Lord lived to be fifty years old.<sup>2</sup> 'For this assertion, which is rejected by the whole Christian world, he quotes in the most emphatic way the sanction of a tradition which he had learnt from the elders.'

(2) 'That the Apostolical traditions in secondary matters—

<sup>1</sup> Such had been St. Augustine's own experience. Dr. Farrar's inability to understand his position is shown by the following note. 'The sentence, "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholicae ecclesiae commoverit auctoritas" (*c. Epist. Manich.* 6) throws a disastrous light on Augustine's theology. He seems to have no conception of truth except as a "deposit" in the hands of an episcopate; nor of the Spirit as illuminating all true souls, but only as speaking by the decision of the orthodox bishops. His notes of the Church (as given in *c. Epist. Manich.* 5) are consistent with a Church as corrupt as that of Alexander Borgia' (i. 602 n.). Amongst these notes are 'auctoritas miraculio inchoata, spe nutrita, charitate aucta, vetustate firmata.' Does Dr. Farrar consider charity, hope, and miraculous powers were among the notes of the Church of the Borgias? But Dr. Farrar misses here, and below in the case of Irenæus, the whole point of the appeal to authority. What is the evidence for the Gospel, the witness of a living Church, which has continually preserved it as a divine tradition from the time of the Apostles to the present? It is the 'consensio populum et gentium.' Surely there is nothing disastrous in Augustine demanding a reason for believing, and finding it in the historical evidence for Catholic tradition.

<sup>2</sup> Iren. ii. 33, 3, ed. Harvey.

as, for instance, on the day for observing Easter—were not always uniform ; that the tradition to which he so triumphantly appeals was not sufficiently trustworthy to save him from errors of history, of biblical interpretations, and even of religious theory.'

(3) That it was unnecessary. 'All that is true in his teaching rests on the sure foundation of the direct words of Christ and the recorded testimony of His Apostles. It is based on the rock of truth, not on the sandy and crumbling foundations of oral tradition.'

Now these attacks on tradition arise from not understanding what Irenæus means. He does not mean the limited tradition of a single authority ; he means the Church tradition, which was valuable because it was uniform. It is 'the tradition of the Apostles manifested to the whole world.' There are many Churches which preserve it, but he selects two as typical and certain examples ; and the agreement of these two with each other, and with at any rate a considerable number of other independent witnesses, gives a strength to tradition which from any point of view must carry great weight. If, then, it is argued that occasionally Irenæus asserts, on the authority of a single individual tradition, some very doubtful fact, we reply that Irenæus himself never confuses such a single tradition with the *consensus ecclesiærum*. If we are told that the traditions of the Church varied on some points, we reply that a case in which the tradition is not uniform brings out strongly into relief that in which it is uniform, and shows that there must be some reason—namely, that of drawing their teaching from a common source—for this uniformity.<sup>1</sup>

But we have Scripture ; what else do we need ? To oppose Scripture to tradition is the greatest of fallacies. Scripture is a part, and the principal part, of tradition. Has

<sup>1</sup> A very good statement of what Irenæus meant by tradition is given by Lipsius, *Dict. Ch. Biog.* iii. 271, 272 ; cf. esp. 'With almost a shout of triumph he opposes to the unstable, ever-changing, many-headed doctrinal systems, and sects of Gnosticism with their vain appeals to the obscure names of pretended disciples of the Apostles, or to supposititious writings, the one universal norm of truth which all the Churches recognize.' Iren. i. 3. 1 (ed. Harvey) : τούτο τὸ κήρυγμα παρειλφία καὶ ταῦτην τὴν πόλιτιν, ὡς προέφαμεν, ἡ ἐκκλησία, καίτερ ἐν ἀλώ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη, ἐπιμελῶς φιλάσσοτε, ὡς ἔνα οἶκον οἰκοίσα· καὶ ὅμοιως πιστεῖν τούτοις ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσα καρδίαν, καὶ συμφώνως ταῦτα κρίνοσσει, καὶ διδόσκει, καὶ παραδίδωσιν, ὡς ἐν στόμα κεκτημένη. Cf. iii. Praef. 3. 1. A similar distinction between παράδοσις and ἐκκλησιαστικὴ παράδοσις is made by Eusebius, cf. Heinichen's (2nd) edition, i. p. 507, and cf. esp. *H. E.* iii. 25, § 6 : διακρίνοντες τὰς τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παραδόσιν ἀληθεῖς καὶ ἀπλάστους καὶ ἀνωρευμένας γραφάς.

Dr. Farrar ever tried to realize the position of a Church teacher in the second century? He was opposed by heresy; how was he to overthrow it? He might appeal to Scripture; but the heretics had their scriptures too. For there were a large number of books which claimed to be apostolic and were not so. How were the genuine books to be distinguished? In this difficulty tradition was resorted to—not the secret tradition of the Gnostics, not the vague and uncertain tradition of single witnesses, but the common teaching of all the great churches founded by the Apostles. Here was a definite fact. Here were bodies such as the Church of Rome, which had been before the eyes of the Christian world from the beginning, with an organized body of accredited teachers who had succeeded to and carried on in each generation the tradition they had received from the past. Surely their agreement in the books that they read as Scriptures, in their customs, their organization, their creed, form a strong argument, strong against the Gnostics of the second century, and strong as a witness to the Church teaching and the Church Scriptures which we have inherited in the present day. Our whole religion depends largely upon tradition; and because we find that as early as the end of the second century the validity of this tradition was tested and examined, we become confident of the truth of the creed we have inherited.

Episcopacy, and especially its foremost supporter Cyprian, receive severe condemnation. 'Cyprian with his mechanical panacea of Christian unity' (i. 353). 'That a true Church cannot exist without episcopacy is an inconceivable absurdity' (ii. 535). As this has been the conception of the vast majority of Christians from the beginning, it is difficult to see how it is inconceivable; it may, of course, be absurd. Cyprian 'helped to stereotype a narrow and material view of Catholic unity, which he identified with the unanimous agreement of bishops' (i. 329).

Now this dislike of episcopacy has two results. In the first place, it leads to an incorrect interpretation of events in Church history. Dr. Farrar is always finding a presbyterian protest: 'The presbyters, in spite of the protest of men like Montanus and Novatian, had practically effaced their own independence in favour of the bishops' (i. 331). Now neither Montanus nor Novatian ever supported the rights of the presbyters. Montanus was an opponent of the presbyters as much as he was of the bishops: he was the champion of spiritual anarchy. Novatian was himself consecrated a bishop by three other bishops, and was the champion, not of the presbyters,

but c  
schis  
tius  
again  
able  
what  
diocese  
He re

A  
Dr. F  
him.

H  
sweep  
the te  
bishop  
holding  
had p  
heretic

Now,  
on so  
true t  
In th  
attitu  
his ow  
Churc  
bishop  
of the  
widow  
prevail  
doubt  
by the  
opinio  
tical b  
'Let h

<sup>1</sup> Cy  
Sancto  
proximi  
sacerdot  
non inc  
virgines  
totum  
scire de  
qui cum  
quae cat  
et cohae  
Cyprian  
ecclesiae

but of the confessors. Similarly, in regard to the Alexandrine schism at the beginning of the fourth century, he says, 'Meletius probably supported the independence of the presbyters against episcopal encroachments' (i. 450). We have not been able to find an atom of evidence in favour of this statement: what Meletius did was to ordain presbyters for another diocese, and to encroach on the jurisdiction of another bishop. He represented disorder, not liberty.

Another result of this dislike of episcopacy is to make Dr. Farrar caricature the opinions of those who differ from him.

'His identification of the Church with the bishop is one of those sweeping generalisations which are at once reduced to absurdity by the test of fact. It amounts to the monstrous assertion that every bishop is infallible. . . . What would Cyprian have said if anyone, holding his own views on the supernatural exaltation of episcopacy, had pleaded his own arguments as a valid reason for siding with a heretical bishop or a heretical diocese?' (i. 310).

Now, it is perfectly true of Cyprian, as of Augustine, that on some points his teaching was erroneous, but it is equally true that Cyprian never taught anything so absurd as this. In the incident referred to concerning Florentius, Cyprian's attitude is misrepresented. It is not to Cyprian, speaking in his own person, but to Cyprian as the representative of the Church, as supported by the authority of the whole body of bishops, that obedience is due. He shows he has the support of the martyrs, the bishops his colleagues, the confessors, the widows, in fact the whole Church. Harmony and peace prevail everywhere. Florentius alone breaks it. There is no doubt of the validity of Cyprian's position. He is supported by the Church. Florentius is asserting his own individual opinion.<sup>1</sup> And to Dr. Farrar's question concerning an heretical bishop, Cyprian's answer would have been perfectly easy. 'Let him appeal to the bishops of his province. The authority

<sup>1</sup> Cyp. *Ep.* lxvi. 7: 'Quare in hunc scrupulum non inciderunt martyres Sancto Spiritu pleni et ad conspectum Dei et Christi ejus passione jam proximi, qui ad Cyprianum episcopum litteras de carcere direxerunt, sacerdotem Dei agnoscentes et contestantes ei? Quare in hunc scrupulum non inciderunt tot coepiscopi collegae mei . . . tot confessores . . . tot virgines integrae, tot laudabiles viduae, ecclesiae denique universae per totum mundum nobiscum unitatis vinculo copulatae? . . . 8. Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse . . . quando ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque divisa, sed sit utique conexa et cohaerentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutine copulata.' That this was Cyprian's theory of the episcopacy any acquaintance with the *De unitate ecclesiae* will prove.

of a bishop lies not merely in his own position, but in the fact that he represents and is supported by the *consensus episcoporum*.<sup>1</sup>

Again we claim to have shown that Dr. Farrar has misrepresented the opinions of the writers whom he criticizes with such extreme violence.

But what is the authority of the Fathers, and how should their opinions be treated? There are two ways. The first is historical. Such is the manner in which the ecclesiastical historian as opposed to the theologian, whatever his opinions may be, should obviously proceed. He should fairly, honestly, exactly state their opinions; he should observe the proper proportion between the different doctrines they teach; he should state on what arguments they support them and against what opponents they defend them. He should state the causes which influence the growth of their opinions; he should distinguish the points on which they agreed with the majority of their contemporaries, and the points on which they were independent. He should point out the part they played in moulding the theology of their successors. Such is the historical ideal.

Now it is quite clear, as we have shown, that Dr. Farrar does not attempt this; he is obviously a controversialist. But the theologian may equally correctly use the Fathers (for the object of the history of opinion is to collect the data on which we can arrive at a conclusion), but how must he use them? Dr. Farrar makes some decidedly strong remarks against holding too high an opinion of their value, but he is most anxious to make them agree with him where he can. While he is perfectly willing to quote an isolated passage or to elevate into prominence single writers who support, or seem to support, his own views, he shows no capacity for using them in a broad-minded and philosophic way, for arriving at an unbiased decision. He quotes them controversially. We will end, therefore, with a few remarks on this more general question.

(1) In the first place we have respect for the Fathers as men, as men whom the judgment of centuries has pronounced, in spite of their natural defects, wise, holy, and worthy of the title of saint. We read their writings and see that they give signs of much thought and of genuine spiritual experience, in some cases, of clear logical power. We examine their lives and find they were consistent with their teaching. We do not regard them as infallible, we know that they have each one of them made mistakes, we know that many of their

argum  
built  
Chris  
(2)  
a Ch  
by th  
teach  
sempe  
lation  
shallo  
used  
tells u  
novelt  
compl  
believ  
been  
many  
have  
what  
astray  
the e  
takes  
quain  
the C  
indivi

(3)  
Tertu  
Farrar  
tullian  
We m  
with t  
recliti  
tullian  
small  
self a  
compa  
accept  
and a

The  
was sh

<sup>1</sup> W  
Vincen  
Church  
a mean

arguments are bad, but we feel respect for those men who built up the creed and theology which we and all other Christians inherit.

(2) But, secondly, they are witnesses to the teaching of a Church which we, like Dr. Farrar, believe to be inspired by the Holy Spirit. And using these witnesses to Church teaching we appeal to that often ridiculed maxim, 'Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.' Dr. Farrar in relation to this quotes, and apparently with approval, a very shallow remark of Archbishop Whately, that it can never be used in face of a minority of even one; but as elsewhere he tells us that it was drawn up 'for the rejection of Augustine's novelties' (ii. 604), it is obvious that he does not really so completely misunderstand the maxim. It means that we believe that there is a common Christian doctrine which has been held by Christians from the beginning: that though many individuals may err, though many parts of Christendom have erred for some time, although the whole Church—or what seemed to be the whole Church—may have been led astray by Arianism, yet the insecure judgments of individuals, the errors of isolated communities, and the hesitating mistakes even of a generation, may be corrected by a wide acquaintance with Christian history. The formal judgment of the Church in a council, *accepted and formally adopted by each individual church*, cannot err.<sup>1</sup>

(3) This will explain why it is incorrect to put the Montanist Tertullian on a level with the Catholic Tertullian (as Dr. Farrar seems inclined to do). In the latter position Tertullian is a witness to the views and beliefs of his own time. We must correct as we can his one-sided views by comparison with those of Clement or of Ireneaus, but subject to such correction we can accept his testimony. As a Montanist, Tertullian, on his own confession, represents the views of a small and insignificant minority, very often probably of himself alone. To compare the heretic with the catholic is to compare the individual with the teacher of an universally accepted truth, the assertion of exploded fallacies with a creed and a system which have survived to the present day.

That Dr. Farrar adopts ordinary controversial methods was shown by Dr. Pusey in relation to Eschatology, and will,

<sup>1</sup> We must remind our readers that this is substantially what St. Vincent says. It is unjust to him and unjust to the teaching of the Church to quote an isolated sentence without the context which gives it a meaning. See esp. Vinc. *Comm.* 28.

we think, be evident by even a hasty perusal of the volumes before us.<sup>1</sup>

We regret that we have not been able to give more unqualified praise to Dr. Farrar's book. We had hoped he might have popularized, as he well could, the study of early Church history. But granting even that the theory of the Fathers concerning the Church and episcopacy was wrong, still no one can write their history adequately who does not realize that they did hold such a theory universally ; that they felt themselves citizens of a common country, members of one community, brothers in one family ; that they looked upon this society as one bound together by a common organization, common sacraments, common teaching, common hopes and fears. Gradually they saw it grow from small beginnings into a great and mighty power. They felt thrilled by the vigour of its advance ; they rejoiced with its triumphs, and felt humiliated by its disasters, and still more by its intestine strife. They saw the great Roman empire to which they succeeded shattered by the attacks of barbarians ; but when Rome fell, the Church endured, and preserved the religion and the culture and the learning of the past amid the storms of the barbarian inroads. It was because the Church was an organized society that it did this ; and even though that theory were an exploded idea, unfit for the present day, no one can write the history of the early Church who makes his work a controversial treatise against the principles that inspired the great fathers and teachers of the past.

<sup>1</sup> We have not thought it necessary to touch on eschatological questions. Only one point we wish to note. Dr. Farrar writes (ii. 604, note 3) : 'As in Calvin and Jonathan Edwards, the blessed are to be indifferent, if not delighted, spectators of these torments (*De Civ. Dei*, ii. 30). How different was the whole system of Augustine from that of Origen ! &c. The reference is wrong. It should be *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 30. The passage is : 'Ea tamen potentia scientiae, quae magna in eis erit, non solum sua praeterita, sed etiam damnatorum eos sempererna miseria non latebit. Alioquin si se fusisse miseros nescituri sunt, quomodo, sicut ait psalmus, misericordias Domini in aeternum cantabunt ?' All St. Augustine says is that a knowledge of the sufferings they have been saved from will increase the feeling of thankfulness to God. The feeling is certainly not one of indifference, much less of delight at the sufferings of others.

## ART. IX.—ROBERT BRETT, HIS LIFE AND WORK.

*Robert Brett (of Stoke Newington), His Life and Work.* By T. W. BELCHER, D.D., D.M. (London, 1889.)

THIS biography of an eminently religious and single-minded Christian layman has been for various reasons delayed until a large part of his generation has passed away. We trust that it will interest and benefit readers of a younger generation, who probably do not even know Mr. Brett by name.

Born, in 1808, at Luton in Bedfordshire, he was educated for the medical profession. He came to London in 1832 and gradually made his way in medical practice there, first in partnership, but finally in practice by himself at Stoke Newington, until his death in 1874.

Events are moving fast, and, to the disadvantage of an age which is of a decidedly revolutionary character, the past, however recent, is soon forgotten, as if it were of small worth. Our indebtedness to good men like the subject of this memoir, who broke up fallow ground, attempted to recall us to old ways and religious traditions, and laid in foundations with more or less of good judgment, upon which we may perhaps be building 'wood, hay, stubble,' rather than 'gold, silver, precious stones,' does not readily occur to a generation which has a high opinion of itself, is always in a hurry, and too largely mistakes movement and change of almost any kind for progress. And yet we owe such men, beyond question, an affectionate remembrance, and a careful study of their life's work.

Mr. Brett's character was in the main of a very solid sort. It was that of a man of real faith in the Church, of love and reverence for authority—while yet he frequently too severely criticized it—who understood the Church of England, in which his lot was cast, to be his spiritual mother, to whom he owed no merely fanciful respect, such as many who speak of him with regard, and have entered into his labours, have failed to pay her. Under exciting influences, he showed at times, as we think, an unwise impatience, and seemed to expect a much too immediate result, and for that end pressed home questions upon uninstructed minds in public meetings and addresses. But the times were such as largely to excuse mistakes.

Dr. Belcher makes good use of letters, speeches, congress

papers, devotional writings, &c., and lets us hear to our advantage Mr. Brett's own voice as much as possible. No mention is made of a diary. His first letter at p. 4 is a manly narrative of what he styles 'my conversion from darkness into light, from the power of Satan unto God.' It is full of interest as a first step in a course of consistent and steady religious progress, one surrender of himself for life, and exhibits the childlike faith and teachableness which ever distinguished him. His active spirit soon devoted itself to the subject of the Church revival which had been the work of the Oxford tracts, and to the rousing men's minds to a sense of the dangers of various kinds by which the Church of England was beset. Of ignorance and indifference in the large majority of Churchmen there was enough to justify one of a nature so zealous and fearless, and well prepared, in resolving to make Church questions the great business of his life. He began this quietly in connexion with his professional work in his own neighbourhood, but soon became a central figure in a movement which made the externals of public worship its subject to a large extent. He saw that such a movement would need control, for as Dr. Belcher writes of him at p. 266 : 'No man ever made a greater mistake than in ranking Robert Brett among "empty-headed ritualists." ' He knew the value of *terra firma* and often spoke with measured distinctness and grave warning, which, had he lived to see more of this special movement, would, we think, have been even more grave. For most of the men who were interesting themselves in it had little ecclesiastical knowledge and a small sense of Church authority. The spirit of lawlessness which is moving this age to the breaking of the bonds which have held society together for ages was invoked by such persons far too largely in the cause of religion and the Church. Many were the occasions on which Mr. Brett tried to restrain and call home to first principles what we must describe as the ill-instructed, ill-disciplined troops, both of clergy and laity, to whom he spoke or wrote. It was a far larger question with him than with most of them, and he saw into it more deeply and intelligently and religiously.

At p. 98, in 'An appeal to Churchmen on Dangers which now threaten the Church,' he says, 'That Prayer Book and those ceremonies which our fathers have handed down to us, it is our solemn and bounden duty to preserve *intact*, and hand on to our children, and by God's gracious help we will do so.' In the same tone he speaks at p. 195 : 'I think the Prayer Book is a subject that cannot be too strongly brought

before Churchmen. It is fashionable now-a-days to totally ignore 'Mattins,' but I think it is a fact to be deplored and protested against,' &c. &c. 'With respect to the present Prayer Book, I am sorry to say that it is not unusual to hear it spoken of in terms anything but complimentary ; in fact there is a large number of people who are agitating for revision.' And he adds, as being an expression of Keble, Newman, and Pusey : ' If we want to have the Prayer Book altered, the only way to obtain our desire is to thank God faithfully, honestly, and conscientiously for what we have got, and wait patiently until He is pleased to give us a better one.' And he says again, at p. 130 : ' Her offices must be heartily accepted and honestly used.' At p. 160 in a speech at a meeting of the English Church Union, he says : ' We are determined to maintain in its integrity the Book of Common Prayer.'

It matters little, with men of narrow and uneducated minds, whether they are of the so-called Catholic or Protestant school, for they adapt their religion to the weak parts of their own natures rather than allow it to enlarge and mould them. The same human weaknesses develop under each system. Sense of proportion is commonly wanting to the professors of both schools. Exaggeration takes its place. *One* day in the week is acknowledged as divine by the Puritan. Other days must do as best they may. *One* service in the Church's list fills the mind of the ritualist, while minor ones, songs of degrees or ascent, are of no moment. Such a one makes short work of them, as Mr. Brett complains of Mattins, and dispenses with the help the Church provides for training him accurately in reverence and ever-increasing fitness.

At p. 163 he writes : ' Let us keep to our own legally-defined ritual, and not strive to imitate that of another communion. Let us cling fast to the heritage we possess, rather than run the risk of becoming losers by giving up our own ground. In a word let us hold fast by the Sarum use.' It was, of course, necessary that he should have gone on at once to define what he meant by ' Sarum use,' for by such an unexplained expression he unfortunately opened a wide door for private judgment. To a mixed audience, it meant nothing short of indefinite licence, which of course he did not mean to give, and had no authority to give. It was meaningless, of course, to those possessed of real knowledge on the subject. Had No. 86 of the *Tracts for the Times*—the reverent and thoughtful teaching of which he of all men would have approved—been present to his mind at that moment, he would never have dropped such a loose expression. His voice would certainly rather have

been one of distinct warning to patience and dutiful submission to the Church's voice in the Prayer Book, as the absolute duty of Churchmen, the one only chance of unity. Would that men would yet inform themselves of the teaching of that Tract, and that acquaintance with it was required by bishops from candidates for ordination.

Like all persons, and especially those of an enthusiastic and sympathetic temperament, who speak in public, he was liable to be led occasionally, by the tone and cheers of his audience, into saying things in excess of his meaning. It is the temptation under which all but the most practised orators continually fall. It was not in Mr. Brett's nature to repress enthusiasm or sympathy, but rather in charity to think of it as of more value than it deserved. Mr. Froude gives us Carlyle's opinion and experience on the subject of public speaking : 'The orator, in the rush and flow of words, cannot always speak truth ; cannot even try to speak truth ; for he speaks to an audience which reacts upon him, and he learns as he goes on to utter, not the facts as he knows them to be, but the facts shaped and twisted to please his hearers.'<sup>1</sup>

Many are the instances of honesty and loyalty, thoughtfully expressed in letters and well-considered documents, which are scattered through the book. It was not in him to steal a march by help of vagueness. Without any reflection on others, it must be said that his nature stood conspicuously above most of those with whom he popularly worked. With him the end never sanctified the means. At p. 275 he is quoted as writing to a friend :—

'I do think we High Churchmen are in great danger of losing our own self-respect and the respect of all upright Churchmen. The manly boldness and straightforwardness of truth, transparent honesty of purpose, and obedience to authority, which ought to characterize the worshippers of the Crucified, are, I fear, too often sacrificed to trickery and evasion, for the sake of getting our own ends. Depend upon it, my good friend, the words of Dr. Pusey will ere long prove prophetically true : "These good men are courting some heavy Divine judgment upon themselves and their work, or, at all events, the blessing of 'the meek' will not be theirs."

He goes on, after describing the act to which he was objecting : 'The last thing I hear is that the priests and you, *the Bishop's officers* (churchwardens), have been engaged in some solemn!!! office to set your Bishop's orders at defiance, and that you have solemnly blessed an act of disobedience to

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle, *Life in London*, i. 189.

autho  
Divin  
Churc  
worki  
privat  
spiritu  
Churc  
for th  
such  
witho  
T  
and c  
Laws  
work.  
soone  
of a c  
worked  
wish t  
was d  
ing pr  
type  
carrie  
ungra  
sions  
surrou  
plenti  
drawn  
more  
At p  
conci  
efforts  
mercy  
Mr. I  
guage  
Churc  
The C  
might  
through  
helped  
light  
more  
quietn  
such a  
as slo  
M

authority.' He asks whether the office of a Bishop is not a Divine office, with authority from Christ to rule in His Church. And he concludes: 'Let us remember that we are working for God, and not for our own self-pleasing.' In private and public he nobly tried to raise and educate and spiritualize the tone of men who interested themselves in the Church movement, but were far from being fit and prepared for the rapid pace at which things were moving. Some of such persons were only recent converts from Dissent, and without Church tradition or training of any sort.

The early watchword of the movement—'In quietness and confidence shall be your strength'—came to be forgotten. Lawsuits were proceeding, and very doubtful ingenuity was at work. Immediate results were aimed at. The seed was no sooner sown than the harvest was expected. This must be said of a considerable part of the period during which Mr. Brett worked, but not as if he was responsible for it, though we may wish that he had seemed rather more alive to the danger. He was dealing with a generation which had not his own restraining principles, with minds of a more shallow and revolutionary type than his own; and we suspect that he was occasionally carried along by a current which he hoped to stem. It is an ungrateful task to criticize the occasional actions and expressions of a man so single-minded as Mr. Brett. But he was surrounded by difficulties; and how far he regretted the plentiful litigation into which the English Church Union was drawn, and considered it to be unavoidable, we cannot do more than guess. But we suspect he had grave misgivings. At p. 239 he pleads for toleration and forbearance, and for conciliatory means, 'and God will give His blessing to our efforts, and overrule all to His own purposes of love and mercy.' And at the end of the Preface Dr. Belcher expresses Mr. Brett's view of litigation generally in still plainer language. By help of such continual litigation the tone of the Church movement was vulgarized rather than spiritualized. The Church had surer weapons in other days, in which it might be said of her, 'They gat not the land in possession through their own sword; neither was it their own arm that helped them. But Thy right hand, and Thy arm, and the light of Thy countenance.' The movement elected to go more and more upon ordinary lines. For faith and patience, quietness and confidence, were qualities which excited meetings such as were being continually held would be sure to regard as slow, dull, and uninteresting.

Mr. Brett's letter at p. 124 to the Bishop of Lichfield

(Selwyn) on ritualism is interesting, but all too sanguine, as events have proved. It assumes many things of the clergy, such as 'canonical obedience' to the bishops, which time has shown to be unfortunately very far from what a certain school, or perhaps any school, among the clergy are disposed to give. Nor will they acknowledge, as Mr. Brett assumes them to do, the authority of the Prayer Book. He describes his own mind and wish rather than those of the clergy. And he uses in this letter expressions of so general a nature that it need not surprise us if the Bishop was not convinced. It is too much the letter of an advocate who is not bound to allow the weakness of his case, because he hopes the best of his clients, and honestly thinks that he has a case well worth the pleading.

Rejecting the discipline necessary for its youth which an insistence on the accurate and loyal use of the Prayer Book, as at least the necessary first step, would have supplied, the Church movement passed at a bound to a precocious manhood. Instead of clergy and people learning by use the spiritual value of that Book, which has a greater hold upon the hearts of the people, when they are allowed to have the fair use of it, than is often considered, it was soon discredited. Services were shortened, mutilated, and omitted altogether. People who had never cared to use it were ready to reform it. To prove its value dutifully on their knees was the exceptional view. Lawlessness and disorder came in apace, and men must have been sanguine indeed who could expect the bishops to give the movement in its downward progress their trust and sanction. For it came by degrees to have few intelligible principles. The clergyman came to be a law to himself, holding himself subject to no authority, either of Prayer Book or Bishop, and things began to look like the beginning of the end.

How much more successfully might Mr. Brett and his friends have fought with his great enemy Erastianism, if he could have kept lawlessness out of the field and got his troops into order under an acknowledged authority such as the Church's voice in the Prayer Book. It was a difficult thing to do, but it was the greatest practical work that a man at that moment could have set before himself. Instead of this a number of questions were pushed to the front by lesser men, which, as we think, distracted him, and order and obedience as great principles suffered.

Erastianism is no new disease in the Church of England. It has been with her from the days of William the Conqueror

until now. A Roman Catholic writer<sup>1</sup> has lately expressed the rejection of Papal supremacy and the large submission to the State which the Reformation effected in the only terms which can describe it :

' William the Conqueror laid the egg and Henry VIII. hatched it. Lanfranc and his suffragans accepted the Reformation in principle; and Warham and his suffragans drew the conclusion.'

The Reformation as we call it was not a mere event of the sixteenth century at all. The Church of England in the middle ages, with a few distinguished exceptions, practically acknowledged the supremacy of the State. Englishmen might claim to be excused the error, since the Pope's temporal position and his constant diplomatic interference in the politics of Christendom must have frequently made his spiritual claims a trifle indistinct to all but men of an exceptional and superior class of mind. Henry VIII. and the Tudor and subsequent sovereigns have profited by this spirit which had always so largely possessed the Church of England, a spirit not to be easily cast out, and certainly not by public meetings. It may well be said, 'This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.' Such spiritual weapons were familiar to Mr. Brett, but there were few like him, and they can only be known or used by men of faith. The prayer of faith must be the first state and attitude of men in such a movement, and light and guidance will follow. ' Guidance in return for loving obedience, did he but know it, is man's prime need.' To such men only as have learnt obedience is granted a hand delicate and comprehensive enough to handle, and an eye capable of seeing the glorious vision of a united Church, rich in spiritual gifts. So is the lesson learnt how to will and to do of His good pleasure.

The Church movement in its later years has been, we fear, a building of airy castles of high danger, and we could wish that Mr. Brett were here to take part in a consideration of its present lawless outcome, which suggests that men have been working with a view to please themselves rather than to accomplish a sound unity. We find ourselves face to face with Congregationalism, a sort of Babel, and with a theology very much inferior to that of the last generation.

Against the principle of Congregationalism, before it had arrived at its present stature, Mr. Brett testified well and vigorously within three years of his death. At p. 187, he is reported to have said at an English Church Union meeting, when speaking upon Lord Sandon's Parochial Councils Bill:

<sup>1</sup> *Dublin Review*, April 1887, p. 323.

'The Bill can only introduce a miserable state of dissension throughout the country. It is magnifying what is one of the evils of the present day—Congregationalism. Every separate parish will have its own ceremonial and its own order of doing things without any regard to the general body. . . . It has been one of the great evils of the existing Church movement. We are split up into congregations, . . . so that instead of having the offices of the Church decently and reverently performed, according to what the Church has prescribed, we have a variety of uses, all differing in many essential features. Instead of the Church presenting a compact front, vigorously opposing all that is evil and gathering all that is good into her bosom, there are separate congregations struggling for their own rights and privileges, and if they do not get them, one party in the Church is offended, and so there is endless confusion.'

The leaders of the movement as it proceeded took little note of the wild spirit which was gathering strength within the Church's fold, while they were ever ready to make fight, prepared or unprepared, with the enemy outside. The most dangerous enemies of the Church are always within herself, but a contest with them is humbling and more difficult, and so they come to be overlooked. Lord Sandon's Bill for promoting Congregationalism came to nothing, but Congregationalism in a more subtle form has triumphed from within.

Materials of a very exceptionable sort were pressed by the movement into the Church's service. The liberalism of the day, which, as it believes in nothing to excess, permits every man in unrestrained liberty, gives and takes, strikes balances without any principle, and cheerfully accepts confusion as a natural consequence, has been much appealed to and utilized. Of such ways and methods the Church of Christ knows nothing, and has no need. Had they been as well instructed in liberal principles as ourselves, the early Christians might have obtained a place in the Pantheon for our Blessed Lord among the gods of Pagan Rome. We have aimed ambitiously high, and it looks as if we have fallen seriously low. Churchmen were much impressed with the idea that they were to mend the Church, as if she were something external to them, and but little with the idea that such work implied a mending of their individual selves. The idea of bringing themselves under obedience to her requirements as a first firm step, and so giving life to much which had become a dead letter, was scarcely entertained. The recovery of lost principles depends on obedience, meek obedience. 'It is to the meek,' says the son of Sirach, 'that mysteries are revealed.' Such meek obedience is the key to the treasures of the kingdom. Of repentance and obedience

men heard too little after the cessation of the *Tracts for the Times*, when the movement became what is called popular, and, may we not add, worldly, and became natural rather than supernatural in its thoughts and ways. The message to the Church of Sardis, 'Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain that are ready to die,' is full of meaning for us. The work has been a movement, we fear, rather than a revival. A vast power lay in each man's hands, viz. to subject himself. May this work yet be undertaken. Church life requires Church order, for which a new apostle seems to be urgently needed, to recover us from a reckless innovation and a self-sufficient private judgment which work disunion and division, fill the spiritual temple with merely natural inclinations and opinions, and hide under a bushel the excellent glory committed to the Church's keeping.

The Reformation was a loud call to repentance for the sins of the Middle Ages. For it the English Roman Catholics of the present day are not free to taunt us as they are accustomed to do. They cannot escape the responsibility by help of sneers and exaggeration. The English Church in communion with Rome for at least five centuries had failed. But a Divine hand intervened for our benefit. Our Prayer Book was the evident gift of Providence under very adverse circumstances. For our sins it put us on a lower level, which unfortunately we do not seem to have understood, but have added to the sins of many generations of our fathers that of rebellion against a providential and merciful arrangement. Can we not take it to heart that the Prayer Book took note under the Divine guidance of the lower level necessary to meet a special spiritual case, and should not a meek and obedient spirit have affectionately submitted to such an arrangement instead of rudely criticizing it? We cannot be aware of the fact of the low condition of the English Church for centuries before the sixteenth century if we do not realize that the reverence suitable for retaining great spiritual aids and gifts was deficient. In our rash criticisms of the Prayer Book we have considered and quarrelled with secondary causes, forgetting that whoever the agents were they were evidently instruments in the hands of God. A Divine hand and a providential purpose are very clearly visible in the penitential tone of the Prayer Book. But instead of by its help lamenting our unfitness for certain privileges, and owning that 'our sins have withholden good things from us,' the Church movement has kept up one constant complaint of the withholding of them, which we cannot

doubt is judicial. We may well fear that we are thus losing the blessing which God has in store for meek obedience. Royal gifts are withdrawn in our Prayer Book, but we cannot obtain them but by the slow process of repentance and of hearty obedience to that which a Divine hand has appointed as our merciful trial.

The only way to obtain higher privileges, higher degrees of grace, must be to use worthily those we have without complaint or insubordination. Have we done so as regards the Prayer Book at any time during the last three centuries? Are we doing so now? For surely to do so is demanded of us if our candlestick is not to be removed.

Dr. Belcher furnishes some uncomfortable, but, we fear, true, remarks upon customs into which 'good Churchmen,' as they are now called, being delivered from the tyranny of laws and principles, have drifted within the last few years. At p. 264 he writes :—

'Among the "advances" made in "Church work" since Mr. Brett's time are some of which he had a great horror, and one of these is the no longer singular custom among professing "good Churchmen" of having bazaars as a means of providing funds for spiritual objects. He looked on this as subversive of the Christian duty of freely offering for religious purposes, and as surely destructive of the principle of Charity. If he had been alive at the time of the late proposal by people in high station to hold a "Fancy Fair" at Gloucester on behalf of the S.P.G., he would, without any doubt, have publicly opposed it. The usual argument was this : " You see all the ordinary means of freely giving have been exhausted, and unless we can offer some value or amusement to young persons, and to those not well affected to the cause who give us nothing, we cannot raise the money, and the building or other work must remain undone." To this he would reply, " Let it remain undone, and better so than have God's house built or decorated by means which are not giving at all. If the work is God's work, it will be done in God's good time. Any how let us not do evil that good may come."

'Such was his line,' Dr. Belcher adds, 'regarding the religious bazaars of his own day ; but they were sober and flat affairs to some of their modern representatives. He would be a bold man who would measure the force of Robert Brett's censure on Church bazaars, lotteries, and other forms of gambling, and on the sale of wine and spirits thrown in "for nothing, you know," to a purchaser of eatables at the refreshment stall, Her Majesty's Inland Revenue to the contrary notwithstanding. Nor could anyone estimate his horrified astonishment at the idea of getting vestments or other ritual accessories or furniture by such means.

'But the times have changed, and now-a days there are not a few who look on these things as evidences of Church life, and of that great and necessary thing "organization," which sometimes looks

like a misnomer for disorganization, so that a man who is not great at "organization"—*i.e.* as sometimes happens, a man who does not upset everything done before his time—is doing "no work." In another thing, too, Robert Brett was behind the present day. . . . He had nothing to do with marrying the theatre in an unholy yoke to the altar, and making amateur theatricals a part of ordinary parish Church work for the amusement of the faithful and for the making of money for spiritual uses; and this often in the Church's mission or school buildings, and with "Catholic" clergy on the parish stage. No! he was made of more sober and dignified stuff than that; and the writer of those spiritual letters of 1838 to the young candidate for holy orders could never believe that a priest was ordained for "work" of this sort, or that devout people who continued day and night in the temple could wish to help forward the salvation of souls in this way.'

Alas! how quickly have these and other worldlinesses shown the shallowness of the soil with which the Church movement has been dealing.

We have had a good deal of talk lately—some wise, some foolish—about the formation of brotherhoods. It is obviously a matter which we cannot here and now discuss.<sup>1</sup> But mean-while all will be interested in knowing Mr. Brett's mind on the subject—a subject on which he had been in correspondence with the late Mr. Bennett (could not Dr. Belcher have given us the actual letter?). After stating that Mr. Brett 'never carried out the idea any further than as concerns the professional guild of St. Luke,' Dr. Belcher adds:—

'Doubtless he felt that brotherhoods in England of to-day must almost to a certainty be out of touch with the general religious sentiment of Church people' (p. 264).

But the air is full of rash schemes to supply our serious defects and shortcomings—schemes which almost seem to be meant to draw off attention from their real causes.

To draw attention by such extracts, helped by facts which crowd around us, to the spiritual exhaustion of a movement in which so many true men have had a share, is no pleasant task. Its most pathetic defeat and failure have to do, however, with children and Church parochial schools. The Universities have gone, and education of a definite and dogmatic kind has gone generally. A generation of parents have dropped the reins upon their children's necks, and seem to think all will come right somehow. Of the parish schools we are repeatedly told by their lukewarm upholders that their going over to the Board is only a question of time. If such schools are doing

<sup>1</sup> See a remarkable paper on *Brotherhoods* by the Bishop of Ripon in the *Contemporary Review* for January 1890.

a definitely religious work on Church lines, as being in God's hands, we might disregard such statements. But we fear they are not, and that the children are not definitely taught and disciplined in them, as members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. Religion of a dislocated kind, in unintelligible bits and scraps, not worthy the name of theology, is furnished to them. We speak from experience of efforts made privately, in Sunday teaching, to do once a week what any Church school is bound to do daily. The children had not any intelligent religious theory about themselves, or God in regard to themselves, for want of understanding what baptism is and involves. That they were born children of Adam, and had become by a second birth in baptism children of God, they had never realized. The fall in Paradise, and their own birth in sin as children of our fallen parents, had no place in their minds. That God had sent His Son into the world to redeem us; that He had lived and died and risen again for our salvation; that He had formed a Church, of which they had become members in baptism, in which they were born again as God's children, and endowed with the Divine help of the Holy Spirit, was news to them, when put in a consecutive form. That they were waifs and strays no longer was a new light to them, and they certainly brightened up under such a gospel of good news. We could add much more, such as that they could not find anything for themselves either in Bible or Prayer Book, though this was quickly and wonderfully learnt when they had received a key. We can testify that no baby tales and condescending accommodations were needed. The Bible and Prayer Book overflowed with interest to them, and were more than enough. We rather wondered in what subjects the Bishop's Inspector tested their knowledge. It seemed as if it must be in the merest head-knowledge.

Has the Church movement left no mark upon our schools? We fear not; for even the Catechism was very imperfectly known by these children. Have not the clergy become patrons of amusements which, *if* needed, had better be left to laymen? Temperance societies, young men's societies of a secular tone and tendency, drum and fife bands, and such like things, are abundant, while spiritual instruction in the way of life eternal, on definite lines in any intelligible form known to the Church, is remarkable by its absence. We must, we fear, be preparing for a wonderful future, in which not Christ, but Antichrist, will be acknowledged.

Dr. Belcher's remarks upon the present downward tendency

of to  
enla  
heav  
how  
exam  
to ta  
side  
upon  
men  
road  
were  
abo  
The  
But  
of th  
'Des  
into  
the w  
them

The  
the C  
entan  
dence  
need  
life a  
upon  
which  
not b

1. *The*
2. *Did*
3. *An*
4. *An*

Two  
livered  
of cat  
minist

of tone in Church work are very important, and have led us to enlarge on the subject. The reaction seems to show us how heavy was the work in which Mr. Brett was engaged, and how much, with God's help, he assisted to uphold by his example and uncompromising thoroughness. It is necessary to take note of this decadence carefully, and to urge its consideration, or the Church movement must continue to go on upon a road which is likely to lead to mere worldliness, while men are carelessly supposing themselves to be in the same road as that in which a generation of venerated Churchmen were so lately walking. John Bunyan can tell us a good deal about mistaking roads and ways, and coming to serious grief. There is the hill 'Difficulty,' up which the narrow way lies. But there is a choice of two easy ways, to the right and left of the hill—the name of the one 'Danger,' and of the other 'Destruction.' And again, he describes 'a way which put itself into the Pilgrim's way, and seemed withal to lie as straight as the way in which they should go ; both seemed straight before them.' But one of the two leads to the Castle of Despair.

The times call for careful walking in traditional ways, or the Church and the world may soon be found in one mad entanglement. Everything is being shaken ; outward evidences and helps to faith are being removed. There will be need for us of the bright faith which beamed in Mr. Brett's life and actions—a faith which rests not upon the seen, but upon the unseen ; not on that which is present, but upon that which is hoped for. Such faith may make mistakes, but will not be finally misled.

---

#### ART. X.—THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

1. *The Educational Work of the Church of Ireland.* By the Rev. H. KINGSMILL MOORE, A.M., Principal of the Church of Ireland Training College, Dublin.
2. *Diocesan Reports, 1887, 1888.* (Dublin.)
3. *Annual Reports, Training College.*
4. *Annual Reports, Church Education Society.*

Two hundred years ago Archbishop King, in a Charge delivered at Cashel and Dublin, urged on his clergy the necessity of catechizing the young as a foundation for their pulpit ministrations to their flocks, and bade them divide the Cate-

chism into fifty portions and take up one every Sunday in the year. In this Charge we meet the first earnest effort of the Church of Ireland to discharge its duty to its younger members. The next movement which we have record of is that which led to the foundation of the so-called 'Charter Schools,' about the aims and successes and failure of which Mr. Froude has written some eloquent paragraphs.<sup>1</sup>

These schools were founded under a royal Charter (7 Geo. II., October 24, 1733) for erecting English Protestant schools in Ireland. They were confessedly schools for the purpose of instructing 'the children of the Popish and other poor natives of our kingdom of Ireland in the English tongue, and in the principles of true religion and loyalty, in all succeeding generations.' The avowed object was thus what is now called proselytism. In the earlier part of the eighteenth century the Church of Ireland had not yet given up as hopeless the task of winning the people over to the principles of the Reformation.

Under the Charter a large number (141) of the bishops and dignitaries, and of the nobility and gentry of Ireland were incorporated as a society, 'to have continuance for ever by the name of the Incorporated Society in Dublin for Promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland.'

In the more detailed account of the objects of the Society, given in the body of the Charter, it is set forth that, besides instruction in the English tongue, the children of the 'Popish and other poor natives' are to be taught to read the Holy Scriptures, and other good and pious books, and to be instructed in the principles of the 'Protestant religion established in our kingdom.' Writing, arithmetic, and such other parts of learning as to the Society should seem fit are to be added, and the pupils are to be 'brought up in virtue and industry, and to be instructed in husbandry and housewifery, or in trades or manufactures, or in such like manual occupations as the said Society shall think proper.'

By subsequent letters patent (32 Geo. III., 1792) additional privileges and grants were made to the Society, which was thus rendered capable of holding real property to the value of 5,000*l.* a year.

The good Primate Boulter, half ecclesiastic, half politician, during his long administration of the affairs of the Established Church was ever a warm promoter of the Charter schools, and Mr. Froude has hardly done this great man justice in slightly

<sup>1</sup> *The English in Ireland*, vol. i. pp. 514, 517, 520; vol. ii. p. 450; vol. iii. p. 187.

dispe  
of GM  
gene

I

Irelan  
intend  
made  
neglect  
tutio  
of trad  
system  
childr  
pupil  
highes  
manag  
an atm  
only wAt  
school  
the sy  
land.  
Church  
the ch  
duced  
suppor  
but do  
corpora  
scholar  
tion to  
grade i  
pass in  
themsel  
fessionaThe  
lytizing  
minded  
whereby  
judices,  
for all.  
Hibernia  
Free Pr  
Dublin.<sup>1</sup> No  
since 1832

disposing of the character of his zeal by stating that the name of God is not to be found in any of his letters.

Mr. Froude's testimony to the value of these schools is generous.

'Ingenuity could have devised no better gift to impoverished Ireland than a school of this kind in every barony. Such was the intention of the founders, and care and honesty might with ease have made the intention into act. For care and honesty there was only neglect and jobbery, and therefore it was not carried into act. Institutions are nothing without efficient men to work them. The wreck of trade and the disorganization of labour destroyed the apprentice system. The master and mistress plundered the funds, starved the children, and made the industrial system an excuse for using the pupils as slaves to fill their own pockets. In a country where, from highest to lowest, forgetfulness of duty was the rule of life the managers of schools were not likely to be an exception. . . . In such an atmosphere a generous conception like the Charter schools could only wither.'

At first the children of the Popish natives flocked to the schools; but in the course of the second half of the century the system withered as a reforming agency for 'Popish' Ireland. The schools were denounced by the clergy of the Church of Rome, and became by degrees purely schools for the children of Protestants. As such the Charter schools, reduced very much in number and long since stripped of all support from public funds,<sup>1</sup> still survive, and not only survive but do a noble educational work. There are one or more Incorporated schools in each province of Ireland, and foundation scholarships are annually awarded after a searching examination to the most promising candidates. The school of highest grade is at Santry, co. Dublin, from which large numbers pass into Trinity College, and not a few have distinguished themselves in the Church, at the bar, and in the other professions.

The system of the Charter schools, with its avowed proselytizing purpose, having broken down, good and liberal-minded members of the Church cast about for some plan whereby, without offending reasonable Roman Catholic prejudices, aid might be given to secular and Scriptural education for all. There were societies formed for this purpose, as the Hibernian (London) Society in 1740, the Smith's Schools, Free Private Schools, and 'the South-Eastern Schools' in Dublin. Government granted limited aid to voluntary schools

<sup>1</sup> No public grant has been enjoyed by the Incorporated Society since 1832.

on certain conditions ; but the educational state of the country was deplorable. At the beginning of this century but a small proportion of the population could read and write. A parish priest, writing in 1817 to the Kildare Street Society, said, 'I enquired in 1810 into the state of education among the poor in —, and found that of a population of 3,600 not more than 200 could read.'

All this time the people were athirst for knowledge. This is proved by the multiplication of 'hedge schools,' where the most villainous type of literature was studied under the guidance of ignorant men, who lived by giving to the young and old a smattering of the three Rs.

The first serious effort to remedy this state of things by supplying a high-class education on religious principles was made by those who in 1811 founded 'the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland,' long known as the Kildare Place Society, but now merged into another institution. This Society was conducted on liberal principles. Secular education was offered to all, combined with the reading of the Scriptures in either Protestant or Roman Catholic version without note or comment. It appears that the teacher could qualify for a grant under this Society by confining his selections to Judges or Chronicles, or he might read thus without explanation the Epistle to the Hebrews or the Revelation of St. John.

The founders believed that its grants to poor schools throughout Ireland would have been deemed by the Church of Rome a boon so considerable, and the conditions so easy, that advantage would be generally taken of the offer of books, of trained masters, and of money grants, and that a religious and loyal population would gradually be developed. Nor were their earlier hopes misplaced. For many years, as the annual reports of the Society testify, an equal number of masters and mistresses from the two rival Churches was trained in School Street or in Kildare Place. In the schools no questions were asked as to the religion of any child ; no catechism was taught, but a chapter of the Bible was daily read.

The training schools in Kildare Place were erected in 1815 by a Treasury grant of 6,980*l.* This fact indicates the confidence at first placed in the Society. Subsequent grants of equal liberality were added. The success of the Society was great. In 1821 the number of schools in connexion was 381, and 26,474 children had up to that time passed through them. The Society was also a 'pure-literature society,' and issued in its first three years 371,000 copies of cheap books of whole-

some tendency. For many years it circulated over 120,000 such volumes annually, a prodigious number when the difficulties of post and transit at that period are taken into account.

But even with this liberal system the Church of Rome soon found fault. Lord Cloncurry's resignation of office on its list of patrons, followed by the secession of its vice-president, the Duke of Leinster, in 1822, were due to this influence. The people at large, however, were far from sharing the hatred of the priests to the reading of the Bible. The Commission of Enquiry which led to the establishment of the National Board of Education reported in 1820 that more than half the children in the Society's schools were Romanists; and the second report of the same Commission brought to light the fact that in 4,179 schools in Ireland unconnected with any religious society, of which 2,607 were conducted exclusively by Roman Catholic teachers, the Holy Scriptures were read.

But the clergy were too strong for the philanthropists. As they had set their faces against the Charter schools because they were distinctly proselytizing, so they set their faces against the Kildare Place Society schools, which only read the Bible, in either version, without note or comment. The idea was hateful to them that joint religious instruction of *any kind* should be given to the children of the Church and to heretics. Joint Scriptural education was found to be a chimera.

The attention of Parliament having been drawn from time to time, first to the need of schools of a high class, then to the successes of the Society, and lastly to the attitude of the Romish clergy, the Royal Commission already referred to was appointed, and reported annually for nine successive years. At the close of this period, in September 1831, Mr. Stanley moved for and obtained the sum of 30,000*l.* to be applied for educational purposes in Ireland, and a Board was created to superintend the expenditure of the money. At the same time the grants to the Incorporated Society, and to the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland, were withdrawn. The former became a purely voluntary society; the latter, under altered conditions, merged into another society, soon to be described.

The national system has undoubtedly enabled Ireland to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. Intellectual and social development have followed in its track. How far it has led the population in paths of religion, of loyalty, of morals, the reader will please to judge for himself.

The appointment of Whately to the metropolitan see

synchronized with the establishment of the National Board. It was commonly believed that he was selected by Earl Grey for the purpose of carrying out the system. This surmise is contradicted by his biographer.<sup>1</sup>

The Archbishop threw himself warmly into the system, with the most single-minded desire of extending the blessings of civilization and intellectual culture, and, as far as possible, Scriptural knowledge likewise. It was possible at first to leaven the system with much of religious truth; and by Whately's influence a volume of extracts from Scripture, and his own *Evidences of Christianity*, were adopted by the Board. But after several years he found that faith had been broken with the public, and that the system had become purely a secular one, with a conscience clause under which any child could be withdrawn from all religious instruction.<sup>2</sup>

In 1853 the Archbishop severed his connexion with the Board. It was after the death of Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, who had always supported the books of *Scripture Extracts* and *Christian Evidences*. Archbishop Paul Cullen was a man of a different type, an Ultramontane and a narrow ecclesiastic. The Protestant Archbishop felt that a breach of faith had been committed, and severed his connexion with the Board, while continuing to pay till the end of his life the salary of a catechist in the model schools.

But during these two-and-twenty years he had been an object of suspicion to that large section of the Irish clergy who objected to the National system on the ground that, while it permitted and encouraged separate religious instruction, it did not make the reading of the Scriptures compulsory on all children attending, or permit the use of the Bible at all hours.

The outcome of these objections to the National system was the establishment in the year 1838 of the well-known and most useful Church Education Society,<sup>3</sup> the principles of

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Archbishop Whately*, by his daughter, p. 75, edit. 1868.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> From the Jubilee Report of the Down and Connor and Dromore Church Education Society it appears that that diocesan society was founded in September 1838; that for many years 240 schools in cos. Antrim and Down were connected with it; that during its fifty years' operations it has expended 214,000/- of voluntary subscriptions, and has had on the roll of its schools 250,000 names of scholars. In the year 1852 it numbered on the rolls 17,618, of whom 6,930 were Protestant Nonconformists and 2,167 Roman Catholics. On the withdrawal of Parliamentary aid to the Kildare Place Society the committee transferred their training school and practising school and repository to the Church Education Society, who managed them until 1884.

Jan.  
ard.  
rey  
e is  
  
em,  
ngs  
ible,  
t to  
by  
and  
ard.  
ken  
ly a  
child  
  
the  
tho-  
ooks  
shop  
stane  
felt  
his  
the  
ols.  
an an  
ergy  
that,  
struc-  
sory  
at all  
  
stem  
own  
es of  
  
hurch  
ed in  
n and  
ons it  
on the  
num-  
rmists  
ry aid  
aining  
cation

which required that in all schools connected with the Society all the children should receive daily instruction in Holy Writ, and that at no time of the day should it be forbidden to refer to or to use the sacred volume. The support of the Church Education Society was long held to be a test of fidelity to the Church, and many clergy were left in the shade of obscurity and passed over where Government promotion was going because they declined to adopt the principles of the National Board, viz. 'joint secular and separate religious instruction.' The Erastians of the day went to a man with the Government system, and it was hard for any spiritually-minded Churchman to avow himself favourable to the principles of the 'Board.'

That a generation has now grown up with different views is a remarkable sign of the times. The larger proportion of the clergy now heartily work under the restrictions of the Board of Education, and make no complaint of any difficulty in giving ample religious instruction to all Church children.

The general recognition of these more liberal opinions synchronized pretty nearly with the disestablishment of the Church. The Church came round for the most part to the opinion that while the State was responsible for secular the Church was responsible for religious instruction, and that under the new conditions of Church finance it had become impossible for the Church to compete with the State in giving secular education.

Lastly, the people adopted the National system, whether the clergy approved or not. The struggling schools of the Church Education Society, more and more eclipsed by the flourishing Board schools, could not retain the majority of the children. Many of the teachers of the former were now growing old and infirm, and their places were not readily filled. The liberty granted by the rules of the Board to teach the Bible and Church formularies daily in the National schools was pleaded by the parents as a reason why the clergy should no longer refuse to adopt the system, or at least to work with it; and under the influence of these combined forces the majority of the clergy of the present day have gratefully accepted the boon given by the State, and their National schools—practically denominational and with, as a rule, not a single Roman Catholic name on the rolls—are as much the clergyman's preserve as he could reasonably desire.

As a practical test of this fact the reader will find below that in the Dublin diocese the inspector of religious instruction has found the same percentage (58) of good answering

in the National and non-National schools of the diocese in his examination in Holy Scripture and Church formularies.<sup>1</sup>

The Church having thus arrived at the conclusion that secular education might safely be left to the State, and that full responsibility rested on the Church to give the best possible religious training, proceeded within a few years after disestablishment to organize the educational work which thus rested on her to provide.

The system as it now stands may be described as follows in the words of the author of the pamphlet first on our list:—

'The education work of the Church falls under three main heads—(1) *the Church of Ireland Training College*, which supplies the first requisite in all schemes of education, namely, a body of thoroughly qualified teachers; (2) *the Board of Religious Education of the General Synod*, which acts as an examining body, (a) to give teachers certificates for religious knowledge, (b) to encourage religious training in intermediate schools; (3) *the Diocesan Boards of Education*, which superintend religious and primary education throughout Ireland.'

A sketch of the constitution and work of each of these will make clear to the readers of this Review the present state of Church education in Ireland.

1. *The Church of Ireland Training College*.—To the zeal of the Archbishop of Dublin, Lord Plunket, is due in chief measure the establishment of this college as a recognized branch of Church work. It occupies the premises of the old Kildare Place College, close to the splendid park into which the historic 'Stephen's Green' has been converted by the munificence of the Guinness family. The old premises have, however, been both modernized and enlarged. The college is directly under the control of the General Synod, which took it over as a department of Church work in the session of 1884. A committee of four bishops and twenty-four clergy and laity have carried out its organization, this committee being partly appointed by the Synod and partly representing

<sup>1</sup> The Church Education Society still claims to have in connexion with its system schools in the various dioceses to the number following. The definition of a Church Education school has been enlarged until it has come to include not only a school inspected by the Society, but one 'declared by the patrons to be connected with the Society and conducted on its principles.' Armagh, 1; Clogher, 3; Derry, &c., 26; Down, &c., 94; Tuam, &c., 19; Dublin, &c., 58; Ossory, 42; Waterford, 20; Cork, 62; Kilmore, &c., 5; Killaloe, 8; Cashel, &c., 13; Limerick, &c., 27; Meath, 4. The Society granted to some of the above dioceses for the schools in 1887-8 the sum of 493*l.*, which now represents the whole expenditure on schools of a Society which for many years spent 7,000*l.* a year.

the f  
organ  
are tw  
ment,  
not h  
pursu  
Street  
other  
is als  
are re  
sidy t

T  
of the

'A  
vantag  
secular  
to sup  
the ed  
cation  
interes

'T  
all res  
for a s

'E  
under  
and u  
Oppor  
Latin,  
experi

'T  
the fir  
and, b  
will re  
art of r

'T  
system

'W  
place t  
lege au  
of thei  
care.'

Ur  
its pri  
Traini  
work l  
With  
places

the founders of the college, who were working hard at its organization before the Synod undertook the control. There are two departments in the college—the Government department, which trains for one year certificated teachers who have not had previous training, exactly on the same plan as that pursued in the Government Training College in Marlborough Street. It also takes for a two-years' course monitors and other candidates who pass the entrance examination. There is also the non-Government department, in which students are received for one year's training, and which enjoys a subsidy from Government, on certain conditions.

To quote the words of Mr. Moore's pamphlet : speaking of the college, he writes :—

' As now constituted the college combines all the religious advantages of the old Kildare Place College, together with all the secular advantages of Marlborough Street. Its object is not merely to supply a class of masters and mistresses thoroughly adapted to the educational requirements of the day, but to ensure that the education of our children shall be entrusted to teachers who have the interests of their Church at heart.

' The students of both departments receive the same training in all respects, except that those on the non-Government side remain for a shorter period.

' Every facility is given for obtaining the highest classification under the Commissioners of National Education in secular subjects, and under the Board of the General Synod in religious subjects. Opportunities are also afforded for getting certificates for Greek, Latin, French, drawing, vocal music, and the various branches of experimental physics.

' Throughout their course of training the students teach regularly in the first-class schools now established within the walls of the college, and, both by means of criticism lessons and personal instruction, will receive every possible help towards successfully acquiring the art of teaching.

' There is a special course of instruction in the Kindergarten system.

' When the students leave the college every exertion is used to place them, in their order of merit, in suitable schools ; and the college authorities will continue to interest themselves in the promotion of their students so long as they show themselves worthy of their care.'

Under its new constitution and the devoted labours of its principal, the Rev. H. K. Moore, A.M., the course of the Training College during the four years of its reorganized work has been not only satisfactory but marked by success. With the rarest exceptions, its students have taken high places at the final examinations held under Government, and

have also qualified for certificates of the first, second, and third class at the examinations held by the Board of Education of the General Synod. During the four years (1884-1887) 322 certificates were awarded by the Board to Training College students. The total numbers in training have been: Government students, 221; non-Government students, 104: total, 325. Thus it appears that, with three exceptions, all the students have left the college provided with the certificate of religious knowledge of the General Synod. (For the total number awarded in twelve years see below, p. 447.) In 1888 an examination at the college for money prizes by the Board in connexion with the Christian Knowledge Society resulted in the award of 74*l.* 10*s.* to seventy-one students.

The funds of this institution, upon the maintenance of which much of the future well-being of the Church of Ireland depends, are derived, as already stated, partly from Government grants, but in a large measure from private subscriptions; and we do not know many channels through which the liberality of English Churchmen can flow more likely to be productive of lasting spiritual good than this. The religious instruction given in the college is in fullest accord with Church principles.

2. *The Board of Religious Education of the General Synod* has been in operation since 1876. The bishops of the Church, with diocesan, clerical, and lay members, elected by the Synod, and certain co-opted members chosen by the bishops and elected members, constitute the Board. There are four trustees and an executive committee. The Board does not undertake the work of inspection or examination of pupils attending primary schools throughout Ireland, which, as we shall see, falls to be done by the various diocesan boards. Its operations are twofold: (1) the religious instruction and examination of teachers; (2) the examination of intermediate schools in religious knowledge. In pursuit of the former of these objects the Board makes it its first aim to reach all the Church of Ireland teachers in training in the Government Training College in Marlborough Street, where only secular instruction is given by the professors appointed by the State.

It is plain that next to the work of the Church Training College itself comes this effort to influence by religious principle, and train in religious knowledge, the young men and women who are soon to be scattered over the country as teachers in Government schools under Church management. There is only a short year for the work to be

done  
dida  
while  
their  
all p  
cult  
publ  
made  
catee  
Street

T  
has r  
has l

of th  
among  
prog  
year  
train  
this  
during  
awar  
of 92

Males  
Female

C

Males  
Female

In  
previ  
is to  
of te  
that,  
they  
these  
of ca

Males  
Female

The g  
this B

done in, and it is a year in which the minds of the candidates are pretty fully occupied by their secular studies; while most of them are, out of college hours, free to enjoy their one year of city life before they are scattered to all parts of the land. Consequently the work is as difficult as it is important; and it is a cause of regret that the public do not seem to value at the proper rate the efforts made by the Board, or to enable it adequately to pay its catechists, who attend daily during term time at Marlborough Street.

The Christian Knowledge Association, 37 Dawson Street, has recently come to the aid of the Board of the Synod, and has liberally placed funds for prizes at its disposal.

The second branch of the work of the Education Board of the General Synod in promoting religious knowledge among Church teachers is further carried out by publishing programmes of religious instruction, and holding twice each year examinations, at centres, of such teachers, trained or in training, as may present themselves. The principal part of this work naturally is done in the two training colleges, and during the period 1876-88 certificates of merit have been awarded to teachers in training in these colleges to the number of 920. The distribution has been as follows:—

*1. Marlborough Street Training College.*

<i>Males</i>	1st class, 3.	2nd class, 25.	3rd class, 77.	Total, 105.
<i>Females</i>	1st class, 5.	2nd class, 44.	3rd class, 130.	Total, 179.

General total for Marlborough Street Training School, 284.

*2. Kildare Place Training School.*

<i>Males</i>	1st class, 30.	2nd class, 95.	3rd class, 146.	Total, 271
<i>Females</i>	1st class, 31.	2nd class, 181.	3rd class, 153.	Total, 365.

General total for Kildare Street, 636. In all 920.

In the various dioceses a few teachers who had been previously trained in Dublin have presented themselves. It is to be regretted that once the training is over the time of teachers is so fully occupied in their various parishes that, not being required to present themselves for examination, they have not as largely as was to be wished competed for these certificates. The number awarded hitherto to this class of candidates is

<i>Males</i>	1st class, 9.	2nd class, 24.	3rd class, 33.	Total, 66.
<i>Females</i>	1st class, 11.	2nd class, 36.	3rd class, 16.	Total, 63.

The grand total of certificates hitherto issued to teachers by this Board stands therefore for twelve years at 1,049.

It falls to the lot of the Board of the General Synod also to encourage religious education in the intermediate and higher schools in Ireland. The 'Incorporated schools' are an important class, numbering eight in Ireland, and containing 241 foundation scholars and many private boarders.

In 1887 intermediate school pupils were examined at 28 centres; 780 young persons competed, and 579 passed: percentage, 74<sup>1</sup>. Nine gold and 16 silver medals were awarded, of which 4 gold and 7 silver fell to the pupils of the Incorporated Society's schools.<sup>1</sup>

Prizes for creditable answering in the Greek Testament are a feature of these examinations; 28 were awarded in 1887. When it is remembered that, in addition to the maintenance of primary schools in Ireland, the State (out of the funds of the Disestablished Church exclusively) promotes by annual examinations, at which passes, honours, prizes, and results fees are awarded, the secular instruction of all these schools of a higher class, it will appear clearly that the Church will fail in her duty if she does not attempt to promote and to reward success in religious education in the same schools. The attention of the teachers and pupils of the schools attended by the children of the upper and middle classes is so concentrated in the present day on success in all the competitive examinations that there is more danger of the religious instruction of these falling into the background than that which exists in the case of the primary schools. A large development of this part of the work of the Board would follow, were its claims on the liberality of Church people more generally recognized. The last reports, however, do not lead us to take a too favourable view of its prospects, financially speaking.

*3. The Diocesan Boards of Education.*—Diocesan organization was one of the first results of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. At this moment it seems to those who have taken part for the last eighteen years in Church Synods and Councils scarcely imaginable that previous to the year 1869 no such thing as a Diocesan Synod existed in the Church of Ireland. In the previous year the Rev. H. W. Stewart, then rector of Rathaspick, was thought to do a rather daring thing in publishing a pamphlet pleading for the formation of Diocesan Synods, and explaining that the diocese, and not the parish, was the ecclesiastical unit. This was a new (and

<sup>1</sup> Since the commencement in 1881 of these examinations of intermediate schools the Board has awarded certificates as follows: senior grade, 958; junior, 273. Medals—gold, 18; silver, 120.

to the  
doctrin  
to be

TI

when  
1874

Board

religiou

to be

Sunda

been 1

and n

the no

genera

and o

dioces

to enc

given

TI

ever, t

1887—

we bel

same e

the ma

her du

So

faith'

The w

Bible t

school

and ev

as rath

did use

end of

the str

church

singing

'starte

pitch-

No cle

cathedr

were as

spoke l

ous bo

N

VOL.

to the average conservative Churchman therefore dangerous) doctrine ; but now diocesan union and diocesan work appear to be the most natural things in the world.

The Synods had been in operation for about eight years when a fresh advance was made. In the diocese of Down in 1874 a motion was adopted for the formation of a Diocesan Board of Education, which should provide for and test the religious education in all schools where Church children were to be found. Neither the Church Education Society nor the Sunday School Society had taken this work in hand. It had been left to voluntary effort, and was sometimes neglected and never done in an organized way. The impulse given by the northern diocese, with its large Church population, was generally followed. Ardfert had a Diocesan Board in 1875, and others followed fast. At the present time nearly every diocese has a Board of Education, and has done more or less to encourage not only the Sunday school teaching, but that given in the day schools also.

These are general statements. We are in a position, however, to make particular statements as well. The reports for 1887-8 of every Irish diocese are before us as we write, and we believe it may be interesting to those who labour in the same cause elsewhere to take a somewhat careful glance at the manner in which the Church of Ireland is now discharging her duty and training her rising generation in the faith.

Some years ago the meaning of the term 'the Catholic faith' was but scantily understood in the Church of Ireland. The writer remembers very well how thirty or forty years ago Bible teaching alone formed the subject matter of Sunday school lessons in the majority of parishes. Many of the clergy, and even a larger number of the laity, regarded the Catechism as rather an encumbrance than a help, and used it, when they did use it, with a suspicious feeling that the beginning and the end of it were not quite 'sound.' Those were the days when the stranger who stood up at the Holy Gospel in the village church was dubbed a 'Puseyite ;' when there was either no singing at all or the psalm according to Tate and Brady was 'started,' or 'lifted,' as the Ulster phrase went, by means of a pitch-pipe. Then chanting was unknown in country places. No clergyman from Antrim to Kerry, outside the walls of the cathedrals, preached in a surplice ; and if a layman at hazard were asked his opinion of the Prayer Book, he would, if he spoke his mind, have said that in many parts it was a dangerous book, leaning too much to Puseyism.

Now the Catechism is taught and explained in nearly  
VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII.

G G

every Church school and Sunday school in the land.<sup>1</sup> The services of the Church form part of the course of study in most of the diocesan programmes, and the Diocesan Boards make it a *sine quâ non* of success at examinations that the children should show some acquaintance with Church formularies.

The following analysis of the work of the Diocesan Boards is the result of a careful examination of the last Reports.

1. *Armagh*.—Paid diocesan inspector ; schools, 161, containing 7,971 Church children ; examined, 5,232 ; passed, 3,569 : percentage, 68.

2. *Clogher*.—No paid inspector ; poor information furnished to Diocesan Synod. In 1889 117 schools were inspected ; 1,694 out of 3,976 pupils passed : percentage, 42·6.

3. *Meath*.—Schools inspected by paid diocesan inspector, 49 ; on rolls, 1,469 ; examined, 1,048 ; passed, 728 : percentage of passes, 66. In 1887 281 Church children were attending Roman Catholic schools.

4. *Derry and Raphoe*.—Paid inspector ; 97 schools examined ; 5,411 present ; 4,225 passed : percentage, 77.

5. *Down and Connor and Dromore*.—Paid inspector ; 200 day schools inspected by him and his two assistants ; on rolls, 15,568 ; examined, 11,469 ; passed, 5,381 : percentage, 47. 12,000 copies of *Sunday School Calendar* sold.<sup>2</sup> The weak point in this diocese is the financial. The Church population is 160,000 ; the contribution to the Education Board, 4867.

6. *Kilmore, Elphin, and Ardagh*.—4,001 examined ; 2,108 passed : percentage, 51. (These were examined separately in the three dioceses.)

7. *Tuam*.—No inspector ; examinations by printed questions issued by the Bishop, who also gives the prizes ; 1,139 examined ; 620 passed : percentage, 55.

8. *Dublin, Glendalough, and Kildare*.—We may give the

<sup>1</sup> As an example of the increased attention paid to the intelligent study of the Church Catechism may be taken the following extract from the programme of the Kilmore Diocesan Education Board : ‘The Church Catechism is a subject appointed (in whole or in part) for all classes ; and the Board has ordered that no prize be given where half the questions asked at the examination in the Church Catechism are not answered correctly ; and in the case of the two highest divisions the pupils must answer intelligently questions on the subject matter of the appointed portions of the Church Catechism in order to qualify for prizes.’

<sup>2</sup> The Dublin Educational Association has drawn up a series of programmes and calendars of religious instruction on the Bible and Prayer Book. These are being gradually adopted by the various dioceses, and it is probable that in two years more the whole Church will have a uniform system for religious instruction.

deta  
ing s  
Boa  
spect  
7,283  
passee  
Natio  
neith  
as te  
of Su  
attende  
perce  
are g  
instru  
to 500

9.  
in the

O  
specto  
judged  
wise  
childre  
1887 7  
Fe  
In Na  
the ‘  
549 : 5

Les  
and tw  
were ex

10.  
religiou  
Smith  
testant  
appear  
passed

10a  
inspected  
trict ex  
present

I.I.  
in conn  
Educati  
About 1  
are ins

details more fully for this diocese. There is an able organizing secretary, the Rev. J. W. Tristram, M.A. The work of the Board is threefold : (a) *Inspection of Daily Schools*. No. inspected : National, 70 ; others, 73 : total, 143. Attendance, 7,283 (434 in excess of 1886) ; passes, 2,900. Percentage of passes to *average* attendance was in both National and non-National schools the same, viz. 58. Thus it appears that neither system can claim superiority on the score of results as tested by examination. (b) *District Examination*, mainly of Sunday scholars. Present, 6,640 (2,200 more than those attending the examination seven years before) ; passes, 4,441 : percentage, 66. The work is rapidly growing. (c) *Lectures are given* to Sunday school teachers, and daily catechetical instruction is given in the Model Schools, Marlborough Street, to 500 Church children.

9. *Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin*.—The work is carried on in the three dioceses separately.

*Ossory* (co. Kilkenny and Queen's Co.)—No paid inspector. State of religious instruction in day schools is judged of by the clergyman's report in each case ; not a wise arrangement in our opinion. 'The best instructed children' are annually examined for prizes and medals. In 1887 717 were examined, 430 passed.

*Ferns* (Wexford Co.)—1,608 children in the day schools. In National schools 508 examined ; passes, 72 per cent. At the 'group' examinations 1,085 were examined ; passed, 549 : 51·5 per cent.

*Leighlin* (co. Carlow).—Twelve schools under the diocese, and twenty-three National ; all inspected : in 1887 1,043 pupils were examined ; 427 prizes and 264 certificates awarded.

10. *Cashel and Emly*.—National schools not inspected in religious knowledge ; non-National examined by the Erasmus Smith inspector. The county is thinly populated by Protestants. On the rolls of thirteen schools only 157 names appear ! At the district examination 455 were present ; 285 passed : 62·6 per cent.

10a. *Waterford and Lismore*.—National schools are not inspected. Twelve diocesan schools, inspected. At the district examinations in twenty-three parishes 743 children were present ; 435 passed : 58·5 per cent.

11. *Cork, Cloyne, and Ross*.—All the primary schools are in connexion with the Board, viz. National, 66 ; Church Education, 51 ; Erasmus Smith, 5 ; others, 8 : total, 130. About 170*l.* is paid to support poor schools. All the schools are inspected. 4,450 on rolls in 1887 ; 3,129 examined ;

number passed not stated. A list is annually published classing all the schools in order of merit as tested by the examination in religious knowledge. This acts as a healthy stimulus to teachers. There is also an annual diocesan examination ; in 1888 2,330 children attended ; passed, 1,466 : percentage, 62. There is also a 'medal examination' in an advanced course.

12. *Killaloe, Clonfert, and Kilfenora.*—Though divided for educational purposes into three we may sum the results as follows : No paid inspector ; National schools not inspected ; examined in 1887 (number approximate), 1,600 children ; passed, 1,000 : percentage, 63.

13. *Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe. Limerick.*—No paid inspector. National schools not visited. Five 'diocesan' schools examined. At the district 'preliminary' examination 624 were present, of whom 426 passed and were recommended for the medal examination : 68 per cent.

*Ardfert and Aghadoe.*—A paid inspector and a Sunday school examiner go the round together. All Church schools, whether National or not, are visited. Results' fees paid to teachers, prizes awarded to children. In 1888 30 schools were examined ; children present, 647 ; 367 passed : 56·7 per cent.

The above figures leave the impression on the mind that, if a good deal, especially in the direction of day-school inspection, remains to be done by the Church of Ireland, a great and general improvement in her whole system of religious instruction and examination has taken place. The percentages of passes are creditable ; answering is far from unsatisfactory. And those best acquainted with the schools are assured that the quality of religious knowledge, and especially of knowledge of Church principles, is steadily rising.

Under these circumstances friends of the Church of Ireland may surely take courage. We have not touched on the subject of the higher or University education. In Trinity College, Dublin, the provost, Dr. Salmon, long the Regius Professor of Divinity, occupies the very foremost place as a scientific theologian, his works on the New Testament and on the Infallibility of the Church having already attained a very wide fame. The present Regius Professor, Dr. Gwynn, who has succeeded him, is one qualified, no less by personal characteristics than by erudition, to exercise a deep influence for good on the rising generation of clergy. The Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Dr. G. Stokes, has made his mark by his admirable lectures on Ireland and the Celtic Church.

The 1  
senior  
is occ  
succes  
Colleg  
There  
thoro

AN

1. N  
S  
2. G  
3. T  
4. O  
S

CARD  
and y  
more  
percei  
notion  
by sig  
This p  
colour  
ear (L  
things  
'segni  
disting

If  
sense o  
some  
word c  
to lay  
selves  
import  
use of  
deeply  
mon w  
sentime  
limited

The Divinity School is at present very well filled, both in the senior and junior classes. The new Chair of Pastoral Theology is occupied by Canon Frederick Wynne, long a voluntary and successful worker in this very line. The work of Trinity College as a school of theology has been freely criticized. There are signs that it is becoming more serious and more thorough.

#### ART. XI.—ENGLISH LITURGICAL COLOURS.

1. *Note on the Sequence of Colours.* By the BISHOP OF SALISBURY. (Salisbury, 1887.)
2. *Guardian*, January 16, 1889.
3. *Truro Diocesan Calendar for 1889.*
4. *On the English Liturgical Colours.* Communicated to the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society by W. H. ST. JOHN HOPE, M.A. (London, 1889.)

CARDINAL NEWMAN speaks of sight as the princely sense; <sup>1</sup> and yet we are told by the physiologists that sight is nothing more than the perception of colour; for all that we really perceive by the eye is a variously-coloured flat surface, the notions of distance and other ideas that we think come to us by sight being mere matters of deduction from experience. This prince among the senses after all, then, tells us only of colour; and when we set up the eye as the master over the ear (Lord Tennyson's verse, 'Things seen are mightier than things heard,' <sup>2</sup> threatens to become more hackneyed than 'segnius irritant') we are really only extolling our power of distinguishing colours from one another.

If the perception of colour, then, be the essence of the sense of sight, it will not surprise us if colours should have some influence in human affairs. To an Englishman the word colours suggests the soldier's flag, for which he is ready to lay down his life; and on reflection there present themselves many instances from history and modern politics of the importance attached to colour as the symbol of a cause. The use of colour as a sign of joy, mourning, or other emotion is deeply rooted in the human heart; and Christianity, in common with many other religions, has availed itself of this sentiment. The use of symbolical colours is, however, almost limited to the Western Church, the East leaving the colour of

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Newman, *The Dream of Gerontius*, § 4.

<sup>2</sup> Alfred Tennyson, *Enoch Arden*, London, 1865, p. 42.

the vestment very much to the discretion of the individual priest. In one instance, however, a rule has lately been set forth in the Russian Church. White is to be used for funerals, not black, because it is the duty of Christians to rejoice that a soul has been gathered to the company of the blest. This rule represents the early patristic feeling better than the mediaeval and contemporaneous use of black or violet.<sup>1</sup> Symbolical colours are, however, not confined to the Roman Church ; for Protestant bodies in Germany and the Scandinavian kingdoms use symbolical colours in their religious worship. We may often see green with the German Lutherans as a ferial colour, while we are told they take blue or violet in Lent,<sup>2</sup> and black for Good Friday ; red is the common colour of the chasuble in Denmark and Sweden, black in Lent.<sup>3</sup>

We have evidence of the liturgical use of various colours in early times. The predominance of white in the Apocalypse must have been noticed by all ; we have gold in the time of Constantine, black in the time of Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople in A.D. 476 ; the mosaics of Ravenna show olive green, brown violet, golden coloured chasubles, all of various shades, of the time of Justinian ; and the evidence of these mosaics seems trustworthy because they represent with accuracy the colour certainly known of other objects, say the *ornamenta* of the households of Justinian and Theodora, and other liturgical vestments like the alb and the pallium.

But of symbolism in colours there appears to be no continuous use until after the time of Charles the Great. We have in our possession a curious little book, apparently of Franciscan origin, printed in 1550 at Venice by Liechtenstein, and bearing the name *Liber familiaris Clericorum*. Folio 227 attributes the ordering of the symbolical use of colours to Boniface III. This would give to the practice a respectable antiquity, but it is more likely a mistake for Innocent III. To this Pope is commonly given the credit of having been the first to introduce symbolical colours into the Church of Rome,

<sup>1</sup> See the authorities quoted in the article on 'Mourning' in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

<sup>2</sup> William Michell, *What did Luther Teach?* London and Frome, 1870, p. 27. In the use of blue the Protestants have continued the old German tradition. A priest of Cologne, writing on ceremonial, rebukes this custom : 'Quia color violaceus afflictionis et abstinentiae tempus magis indicat, quam caruleus' (Gerlaci Vinitoris *Compend. SS. Rituum*. Col. Agripp. 1685, tertia ed., p. 70). This is quite a sensible reason. The local German rites were destroyed by the middle of the seventeenth century, much earlier than those of France.

<sup>3</sup> John B. Pratt, *Letters on the Scandinavian Churches* (London, 1865), p. 84; *Ecclesiologist*, 1852, vol. xiii. p. 31.

but in  
practi  
a doc  
1887,  
used  
Crusa  
of Jer  
this se  
This s  
nearly  
In En  
field in  
to 124  
Richar  
Both  
two ty  
Innoce  
family

The  
Churc  
observ  
Andrea  
speaks  
Day, c  
Chape

Jen  
partic  
been d  
which  
tells u  
dress o

In  
is an a  
Sarum  
of the  
accusa  
means  
anthem

<sup>1</sup> In  
the locu  
<sup>2</sup> La  
Day, L  
<sup>3</sup> Sa  
Service  
custom  
<sup>4</sup> W

but in all likelihood he merely describes the current Roman practice of his day before his election as Pope.<sup>1</sup> And further, a document has been printed in the *Reliquary* for October 1887, which gives an almost complete sequence of colours used in the Latin Church of Jerusalem, founded by the Crusaders early in the twelfth century, soon after the taking of Jerusalem in 1099. Very likely they brought with them this sequence from the West, with the rest of their ceremonies. This sends back the date of the first complete sequence to nearly a hundred years before the election of Innocent III. In England we have a tolerably complete sequence at Lichfield in the statutes of Bishop Pateshull, who sat from 1239 to 1241, and at Westminster in the Custom Book of Abbot Richard de Ware, who ruled the convent from 1258 to 1283. Both these sequences, then, are early in date, and they show two types of colour sequence, the Lichfield belonging to the Innocentian group, the Westminster to the Mediaeval Parisian family.

There is evidence of the use of symbolical colours in the Church of England since the Reformation, mainly, it may be observed, in connexion with the season of Lent. Bishop Andrewes, in one of his sermons preached before James I., speaks of black as the Good Friday, and white as the Easter Day, colour.<sup>2</sup> After the Restoration Mr. Pepys notes that the Chapel Royal was hung with black, it being Lent.<sup>3</sup>

Jeremy Taylor somewhere speaks of purple as a colour particular to bishops. An English bishop seems to have been distinguished by some colour akin to purple, a custom which came down to our own time, for Mr. Walter Besant tells us that as a young man he remembers that the evening dress of a bishop was all blue.<sup>4</sup>

In our Anglican service we often hear that its great fault is an absence of variety, and that in the rearrangement of the Sarum Breviary the reformers ruthlessly sacrificed indications of the Christian seasons for the sake of simplification. This accusation has some element of truth in it, though it is by no means wholly true. We want the varied invitatories, hymns, anthems, and responds of the old service ; the only difference

<sup>1</sup> Innocent III., *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. i. cap. lxiv. This is the *locus classicus*.

<sup>2</sup> Lancelot Andrewes, sermon preached on April 16, 1620, Easter Day, *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theology*, 1850, iii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Pepys, *Diary*, March 8, 1662-3. See also John Jebb, *Choral Service of the Church of England* (Parker, 1843). He speaks of the old custom of using grey or purple for Lent, black for Passion Week.

<sup>4</sup> Walter Besant, *Fifty Years Ago*, London, 1888, ch. vii. p. 120.

in the service as said in a parish church on the Wednesday before Holy Week and the Wednesday in Easter Week may be the collect for the season, or the presence or omission of *Te Deum*, which last is optional. Anything, therefore, within the borders of due Anglican ceremonial that serves to mark fast or festival may be welcomed by us. The colour of a frontal or hanging may serve to strike the key-note of the service, whether it shall be sad or joyful, weekday or festival. This was said two hundred years ago by a canon of Bordeaux<sup>1</sup> of his own office with all its varied parts ; and if this be true of a member of the Gregorian family of liturgies, how much more must it be of our own reformed service ?

The aim, then, of a change of colour in the frontal of an altar or vestment of a minister is to teach. In accordance with the principles laid down for us in the Preface to the Prayer Book, ceremonies are to be 'so set forth that every man may understand what they do mean and to what use they do serve.' A sequence of colours for Anglican use, then, must be clear and plain in its significance, and provided that it be this, it will be no disadvantage if such a sequence can be shown to have been in use in England in mediæval times. Teaching sequences are known to have been prescribed at Lichfield and Exeter, and are to be found in service books belonging to the sees of Canterbury and London. For example, it will be seen at once that red is the colour of princes and the symbol of royalty, and is therefore assigned to the feasts of apostles and evangelists as the princes of the Church. Violet or black is with us the colour of mourning, and therefore may reasonably be used during Lent. White is the colour of innocence and purity, and has been therefore assigned to the birthday of our Lord, free from original sin, to the feasts of the Blessed Virgin and all other virgins, and by long and universal custom to the Paschal season. Some other colour, different from these three, has been assigned to the ordinary Sunday and week day, such as green, yellow, or *varius*. Some such principles must run through any Anglican sequence that aims at following the *dictum* of the Prayer Book that all ceremonies are to teach. There should be no attempt at reviving the exclusive use of the mystical colours of Leviticus, colours which are not even known to us with any accuracy.

Of late years a good deal of attention has been paid to the English liturgical colours. Some of the works that have appeared have been bound in the shackles of unhistorical

<sup>1</sup> Gilbert Grimaud, *La Liturgie sacrée*, Paris, 1678, t. i. p. 72.

theories  
governed  
with th  
contains  
comme  
Hope H  
tion as  
and wi  
paper w  
to us t  
appear  
the rul  
actually  
piece o  
quainte  
patens,  
stall-pl  
an exhib  
posal  
liturgic  
German  
dustrie  
invento  
rare in  
particu  
invento  
of cha  
now th  
Societ

On  
not ad  
ment b  
seems  
determ  
parish  
seen i  
genera  
of col  
in whi  
again,  
through  
Lent.  
of the  
Societ

<sup>1</sup> F

theories as to the sources of the colours, or of the rules which governed their distribution in England. Others have dealt with the subject mainly as it may be seen in the directions contained in the ritual books. This is a method which will commend itself to all with liturgical tastes; but Mr. St. John Hope has shown that there is a field beyond, in the information as to the colours actually in use given by the inventories and wills. Up to the time of the publication of Mr. Hope's paper very little was known of this, and his research appears to us the best and most complete of anything that has yet appeared on the English colours, whether approached from the rules given in the liturgical books, or from the colours actually in use. He may well be congratulated on this last piece of work that he has published. Those who are acquainted with his elaborate papers on mediæval chalices and patens, on mazers, on seals, on municipal ensigns, on the stall-plates of the knights of the Garter, will be prepared for an exhaustive and acute analysis of the materials at the disposal of the antiquary. But in this essay on the English liturgical colours Mr. Hope has surpassed even our ideal of German archaeological work. With the most wonderful industry and patience he has gone through all the English inventories that are to be found from 1220 to 1566, noting the rare instances in which a coloured ornament is assigned to a particular season or festival. For the purpose in hand the inventories contain but a grain or two of corn in a mountain of chaff; yet Mr. Hope has winnowed all this, and we have now the results printed for us by the St. Paul's Ecclesiastical Society.

One result of Mr. Hope's research that will strike anyone not accustomed to the Middle Ages is the want of agreement between written law and practice. Each parish church seems to have had its own rule, and this even to have been determined in some cases, as at Thame,<sup>1</sup> by the vote of the parishioners. This state of affairs is not unlike that which is seen in the Orthodox Church at this day, when there is no general rule, but each priest or parish does in the matter of colours as shall seem good. There is only one point in which the English inventories are unanimous, and this is, again, a striking result of Mr. Hope's labours—to wit, that throughout England white was the liturgical colour used for Lent. An immense list in small type, stretching over eight of the large quarto pages of the *Transactions* of the St. Paul's Society, proves beyond all reasonable contradiction that white

<sup>1</sup> F. G. Lee, *History and Antiquities of Thame*, Lond. 1883, p. 30.

for Lent was universal in England. This was, indeed, noticed by some of the early ecclesiologists,<sup>1</sup> but never before was it proved; and it has been proved now thoroughly. We have white for covering the altar, images, and cross; the curtains, the frontals, the Lenten veil were all of this colour, though sometimes marked with blue or red. The vestments were also white. We have 'chesybylls of whyte for lent to the high autre,' though more commonly 'vestimenta alba pro xl' are spoken of. A very curious and important entry is to be found at Warwick in 1407. 'An hole vestiment of white tartaryn for lenton' is defined. It includes 'ijj aubes, ijj amytes wyth the parures, a chesible, ijj stolis, iiiij fanos, ijj girdelis, ij auter clothis wyth a frontel and a towail, ijj curtyns, a lectron cloth, and a veyle of lynnen cloth.' It is a very noteworthy instance of what our forefathers meant by the word *vestment*.

These vestments were not solely of linen. A number of mediæval stuffs find themselves represented. Besides silk we have samit, tartaryn, fustian, buckram, sarcinet, damask, and the like. They were not always plain, but were marked with drops of blood, red crosses, the five wounds, or the sacred monogram.

Mr. Hope is very firmly of opinion that the English Lenten white was not always grey or ash-coloured, such as was ordered by the rules in France, Germany, and Spain. Besides the two or three instances of ash colour in vestments that he gives, we will present him with the record of eight grey sacerdotal vestments at Magdalen College, Oxford.<sup>2</sup> But we must remember that we are not dealing with scientific rules such as would be given in ceremonial books, but descriptions drawn at hazard by inventory-makers. In not one of the written rules is white spoken of. Even now drapers speak of certain textures as white, classing them all under this heading, which an accurate observer would certainly describe as yellow or blue, not to speak of grey or ash-coloured. Some light perhaps may be thrown on this by the practice nowadays at Lyons. In the *Missale Romano-Lugdunense*, which since 1866 has been the Mass-book for the diocese of Lyons, the ordinary Roman sequence of colours is ordered; yet the canons of Lyons continue to wear during Lent ornaments called ash-coloured or grey, a practice which they think satisfies the rubric; yet the chasubles actually worn could very well be catalogued under

<sup>1</sup> *Ecclesiologist*, 1856, xvii. 124.

<sup>2</sup> J. R. Bloxam, *Register of the Presidents . . . of St. Mary Magdalene College, Oxford*, 1857, ii. 249.

the colour white, and probably would be so described by many.

Now, this practice at Lyons may be compared with the English mediæval practice. Where the English rules are known, black or violet is ordered for Lent. At Westminster Abbey black is ordered for the first four weeks of Lent; in practice, in 1540 we find white. So at Lichfield: black is ordered, white is used. As at Lyons, white must have been regarded as a legitimate substitute for the black or violet of the rules. But we hardly think it would be advisable to restore the use of white for Lent. Everything must give way in this matter to the claims of instruction, and white no longer gives to the English the idea of mourning. In a modern Anglican sequence the colour for Lent must be a sombre colour. We find, too, that after the Reformation there was a return to the earlier practice of using black for Lent.

To other statements often made about the English Sunday colours, Mr. Hope's researches give a direct denial. The Sunday colour neither dominated the week nor was it confined to white or red. As Sunday colours we have all the liturgical colours: white, black, blue, red, green, and yellow appear in the inventories. The written rules, it may be observed, have long been known to give green and red, and at Lichfield *pro voluntate sacristarum*. It is to be hoped that the assertion may never again be made that England knew only two dominical colours, red and white. Then as to the Sunday colour being invariably continued into the week, we have long possessed evidence to the contrary in foreign sequences. There is a sequence of the famous Durandus, Bishop of Mende, printed by Martene,<sup>1</sup> together with his pontifical. In this white is assigned to the Sundays after Trinity, green or saffron to their week days. The same may be found in the pontifical of Elne,<sup>2</sup> written in 1423; the rules made by James II., King of Majorca,<sup>3</sup> who died in 1327, give green for Sunday and saffron for week days; and the *Reliquary* for October 1888 shows us several such instances in France of a like divergence between the colour of the Sunday and the week. Mr. Hope has not dealt with this subject separately, but he gives several instances which show it. For example, at Kirkby, in Lincolnshire, in 1409 there was bequeathed a black vestment for Sundays, and a red vestment for week days. Like in-

<sup>1</sup> Edm. Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, lib. i. cap. iv. art. xii. Ordo xxiii. (Bassani, 1788), t. i. p. 224.

<sup>2</sup> Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, Fondslatin, 967.

<sup>3</sup> Bolland., *Acta SS.* (Paris et Romæ, 1867), Junii, t. iv. p. lxx.

stances are given from Magdalen College, Oxford, and Cobham College, Kent, and we have noticed the same at the Cathedral Church and University of Aberdeen.

There are many other points in Mr. Hope's paper upon which we could willingly linger, if space allowed. We trust we have sufficiently indicated one of the most important contributions to our knowledge of a subject about which an unusually great amount of folly has been vented. Mr. Hope gives all interested the means of independent study, and we join with him in the desire that they may be 'regardless of the "correct" and misleading rules laid down in the so-called ritual directories and other disseminators of error.'

With the private and irresponsible rules of which Mr. Hope so justly complains we may contrast two of the sequences set forth by authority in England within the last two years. One is by the Bishop of Salisbury, and is an adaptation to present circumstances of what is known of the old Sarum sequence. Some have attributed great importance to this sequence as the one universally followed in England. Mr. St. John Hope gives us over again—and we thank him for it—the proof from Clement Maydeston that the Sarum sequence was only one among the other diocesan sequences in England. Mr. Hope tells us this proof is 'systematically ignored' by the followers of Salisbury rule in other English dioceses, and perhaps it is well for them that they do so, for it seems unanswerable. The sequence now published by the Bishop 'is not meant,' he tells us, 'for a complete rule, but may serve till further order is taken in the diocese of Salisbury,' and it is needless to say that when a scholar can leave congenial work like the editing of the Itala and the Vulgate for such details as the right interpretation of the mediæval custom-books of his diocese we must all be glad to receive his help. The Bishop's note (dated November 25, 1887) gives a reading of the celebrated Sarum colour-rubric, which may, we think, be accepted by all well-disposed persons in his diocese. Of necessity it shows the great fault of the original Sarum sequence, judged as a teaching sequence—the use of one colour (red) for every day in the Christian year except at Christmas and Easter, with a few saints' days and festivals.

We notice that the Bishop accepts the view that the *Tempus paschale* at Sarum included Whitsuntide, as it does in all other rites that have been examined, and that therefore at Sarum the colour for Whitsuntide is white. Among the saints' days we think that for All Hallows and the Conversion of St. Paul analogy would rather have suggested red. In order, we sup-

pose  
natu  
week  
nary  
forw  
edra  
much  
blue  
ing.

T  
ture  
whos  
exerc  
the c  
as to  
Linc  
It is  
presc  
for s  
that  
then,  
betho  
Roue  
to ha  
as to  
began  
Rom  
Roue  
sures  
set fo  
preta  
acted  
of th  
was o  
sequen

W  
custo  
their  
sugge  
Churc  
chapt  
Churc

<sup>1</sup> S  
1873),  
were to

pose, to render the sequence as useful and practical as the nature of the case can allow, the Bishop further gives for the week days of Lent and Advent purple or violet, and for ordinary week days blue or green. No doubt Mr. Hope brings forward evidence that blue, with others, was used in the cathedral church as a ferial colour about 1462; but blue is very much akin to violet, and we think that black, purple, violet, and blue should be used only for seasons of penitence and mourning. No alternative of white for Lent is given by the Bishop.

This restored Salisbury sequence appears with the signature of the Bishop only; there is no mention of the Chapter, whose assent in former times was considered needful for the exercise of what is sometimes called the *jus liturgicum*. On the other hand the *Guardian* tells us that certain directions as to colours have been given by the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln, but does not add that the Bishop authorizes them. It is unfortunate that so little is known of the ancient rules prescribed at Lincoln. The *Liber niger* gives directions only for saints' days, and this fragment of a sequence seems all that can be made out about the Lincoln colours. Failing, then, direct information, the Dean and Chapter seem to have bethought them of the early connexion between Lincoln and Rouen,<sup>1</sup> the liturgical customs of which two Churches are said to have been the same, and they have followed the directions as to colours given in the early Rouen books before they began to feel the influence of the Pian recension of the Roman Mass-book made in 1570. The sequence in the Rouen Mass-book of 1623 (one of the many liturgical treasures possessed by Mr. Blew) is nearly word for word as that set forth by the Lincoln Chapter. If this be the true interpretation of the action of the Chapter we think they have acted with great wisdom. They have followed the customs of the Church from which their statutes tell them their rite was derived, and yet given to the diocese as instructive a sequence as that of Lichfield or Exeter.

We wish we could bestow the same praise upon the customs now followed at Truro. There they had, ready to their hands, a sequence which ecclesiastical propriety would suggest to them as the best, the sequence of the mother Church of Exeter, which was agreed upon by the Bishop and chapter in 1337, in order that the ancient customs of the Church of Exeter might be committed to writing and observed

<sup>1</sup> *Statuta Eccles. Cathedralis Lincoln.*, ed. Chr. Wordsworth (London, 1873), p. 3. When the Bishop's chair was moved to Lincoln the canons were to follow the rite of the Church of Rouen.

by those who came after.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hope prints this part of the *Ordinale* at length, and it is a useful and intelligible sequence. But it has met with no favour with the authorities at Truro, who have introduced a sequence of their own devising, and unlike any mediæval sequence actually used that we have met with. It is based upon the untenable theory that the vestments and colours of the Jewish High Priest are the same as the liturgical vestments and colours of the Christian Church. We had thought that this view had been given up by all scholars for more than two hundred years, since it was abandoned by Cardinal Bona;<sup>2</sup> but in the Middle Ages it was the general opinion, though, with the mediæval disregard of consistency in theory and practice, it seems never to have been put into execution. This is very plain in writers like the false Alcuin and Innocent III., who tell us that the vesture of the Christian priest should be the same as that of the Jewish High Priest; yet when they come to describe actual facts, they speak of vestments and colours which cannot be reconciled with a Mosaic origin. And if the mediæval ritualists had no doubt about the colours which the Hebrew writers call purple and blue, such opinions may not be allowed to us, who know that these words are but names which teach us nothing. Who is there that can tell us positively what the Hebrew purple and blue and scarlet were? And even when we think that we touch sure ground in the colour of the gold of the vesture of the High Priest, we find that there are Jewish doctors who teach that this gold was green in colour.<sup>3</sup> It seems hopeless to expect that we shall ever discover what

<sup>1</sup> *Ordinale secundum usum Exon.*, ed. H. R. Reynolds, pp. 1, 10.

<sup>2</sup> *De rebus Liturg.* i. c. xxiv. §§ vi. and viii.

<sup>3</sup> *De Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebreorum*, auctore Johanne Braunio (Amstelod., 1670), lib. i. cap. xii. p. 241. We know too that a solution of gold is green in colour.

There seems to be a prejudice, fostered by Bishop Blomfield of London, against the use of green as un-English. There is no need to stop in order to show the frequent use of green in England in the Middle Ages, but it is by no means uncommon to find green in English churches after the Reformation. With no very great amount of pains we have found the following instances: Green frontal at Pinner in 1625 (*Trans. of the Lond. and Middlesex Archaeol. Soc.* 1870, iii. 177), at St. John the Baptist's, Bristol, in 1635 (Nicholls and Taylor, *Bristol, Past and Present*, Bristol, 1881, ii. 153, 176), at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1659 (J. R. Bloxam, *Register of the Presidents of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford*, 1857, ii. 285), at St. Giles in the Fields in 1660-69 (Dugdale, *Baronage of England*, iii. 226), and under the word 'carpet' an instance for 1702 will be found in Murray's *New English Dictionary*. A friend tells us that he can remember several instances of green-coloured altar cloths in the diocese of London before 1825.

the  
base  
espec  
way  
that  
moth  
We  
count  
were  
suffic  
is gi  
marty  
medi  
evang  
virgin  
princ  
media  
Luke  
would  
seque  
aside  
W  
Guard  
is evide  
It is  
tically  
abstin

<sup>1</sup> W  
and me  
the illu  
thought  
and tha  
other d  
ancient  
be, sha  
be foun  
Contine  
now ha  
frontals  
find an  
the Ron  
them fr  
example  
the pres  
same m  
New C  
is very  
will follo

the Mosaic colours really were ; and it is hardly prudent to base a sequence upon the translation in the Authorized Version, especially when the result has little to recommend it in the way of instruction or antiquity. The Church rule has been that the daughter diocese should adhere to the customs of the mother ; and we regret that this has been broken at Truro.<sup>1</sup> We regret the new Truro rules the more because they give countenance to the notion that the English Sunday colours were only white or red, an idea that Mr. Hope's work has sufficiently exploded ; and they support the theory that red is given to apostles and evangelists only because they are martyrs ; whereas it would be a hard matter to find any mediæval church which does not keep all apostles and evangelists in red, with the one exception of St. John as a virgin. They are the princes of the Church, *Ecclesiarum principes*, and it is on this ground that red was the universal mediæval colour for apostles and evangelists, including St. Luke. Theories so little supported by facts or practice would have received short shrift from the mediæval Exeter sequence ; and this may have been the reason that it was laid aside at Truro.

We miss in the Lincoln rules, as they appear in the *Guardian*, the usual direction of violet for vigils, and there is evidently some confusion as to the rule for Innocents' Day. It is noteworthy that very few sequences (so few as practically to be none) enjoin a change of colour for the weekly abstinence of Friday. If some French pontificals have white

<sup>1</sup> We cannot help noticing another departure at Truro from English and mediæval custom in this, that 'during the weeks after Trinity Sunday the illuminated front of the Holy Table is left exposed.' We had always thought that the canons of 1603 were still the law of the Church of England, and that they ordered the Holy Table to be covered with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff ; in this the Jacobean Canons do but carry on the ancient and mediæval tradition, that the altar, however splendid it may be, shall not be exposed, but covered. We doubt if any instance could be found in mediæval England of an altar without a frontal. On the Continent, however, from either poverty or idleness, many of the altars now have no frontals ; but in the more ancient foundations the use of frontals still persists. At St. Peter's in the Vatican it is a hard matter to find an altar without a frontal of the colour of the day ; and in most of the Roman basilicas the high altar and the altar in the choir have both of them frontals. The frontal adds much to the dignity of the altar. For example, how very greatly improved would be the whole surroundings of the presbytery at Westminster Abbey if the altar were vested. And the same may be said of the altar in Henry VII.'s chapel, of the altar at New College, Oxford, and colleges elsewhere. The bare, naked effect is very unpleasing. We sincerely trust that no other cathedral church will follow the example of Truro in this particular matter.

for Sunday, so as to keep an Easter Day in every week, why not mark the Friday which precedes by a change of colour, and thus help to remind the faithful of the Passion, commemorated on that day? The Cardinals change the colour of their cassocks on Fridays to violet;<sup>1</sup> and in the sequence of James II., King of Majorca, red is to be used for Fridays,<sup>2</sup> so that the idea is not altogether unauthorized.

This we may perhaps bring forward as an instance of the legitimate use of foreign customs. The method prescribed to himself by Mr. St. John Hope excludes wide use of the comparative method, and Mr. Hope is quite right to tread firmly in the paths that he has chosen. But we think, for example, that our ideas about the use of white in England for Lent might be widened by pointing out that a colour akin to white was used in many churches of Spain, Germany, and France. Mr. Hope is so strictly English that he will not even cross the Tweed, and tell us that white was the colour for Lent in the diocese of Aberdeen.<sup>3</sup> And no doubt some of the monstrosities of the English colours might have been paralleled by the foreign sequences. The red for Easter of the monks at Westminster might have been compared with the red for Easter of the monks at St. Germain at Paris.<sup>4</sup> The green and black for Holy Thursday at Thame may be found again in the green at Noyon,<sup>5</sup> or the violet at Verdun<sup>6</sup> for the same feast. The red vestments which Bishop Grandison gave to his church for Twelfth Day are, again, found in many foreign churches as the royal colour for the day of the Three Kings. The black for the Blessed Virgin at Magdalen College, Oxford, would have found its fellow in the black for the Blessed Virgin in the Crusaders' sequence at Jerusalem, and the black at Kirkby for Sundays, in the ferial violet at Le Mans, or the ferial blue at Toledo.

A really scientific treatise upon the liturgical colours cannot be constructed with English materials only. As the English liturgies came from beyond sea it is useful to search beyond sea for their sources, if we are to trace their develop-

<sup>1</sup> Michiel Lonigo da Este, *Delle vesti purpuree et d'altri colori, con quali va' adorna la dignità Cardinalitia* (Venetia, 1623), p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Bolland, *Acta S.S.* (Paris et Romæ, 1867), Junii, t. iv. p. lxx.

<sup>3</sup> *Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis* (Spalding Club, Edinb. 1845), ii. 138, 191.

<sup>4</sup> Edm. Martene, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus*, lib. iii. cap. xviii. §§ iii. and xiv. (Bassani, 1788), t. iv. pp. 151, 152.

<sup>5</sup> *Missale Noviomense*, Parisiis, 1770 (De Broglie episcopo), p. xxxi.

<sup>6</sup> *Missale Virdunense*, Virduni, 1699 (De Bethune episcopo), Rub. gen. cap. xv.

ment.  
the  
at the  
home  
might  
bound  
hope  
the h  
counti

A  
I. Rep  
II.  
2. Ess  
B.  
3. The  
4. The  
th  
5. Nau  
by  
6. Thin  
the

THERE  
political  
which  
of Eng  
of all c  
trast it  
our nat  
this so  
land ; n  
its thou  
so certa  
their so  
nation,  
If the c  
with th  
greatest  
cumstan  
with th

VOL.

ment. Some of the most curious uses of liturgical colours—the changing of the frontals during the Mattins of Easter or at the three Masses of Christmas Day—apparently had no home in England. But, however tempting such an excursion might have been, it would have led Mr. Hope far beyond the bounds of his paper, and he was quite right to resist the attractive suggestion. At some other time, not far off, let us hope that we may have from his pen a complete account of the history of the liturgical colours in all times and in all countries.

#### ART. XII.—PREVENTION OF PAUPERISM.

1. *Reports of Parliamentary Committee on National Provident Insurance, 1885–6–7.*
2. *Essays on the Prevention of Pauperism.* By the Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A. (London, 1880.)
3. *The National Providence Reporter.* (London, 1881–9.)
4. *The Blackley National Providence Insurance Scheme.* By the Rev. J. FROME WILKINSON. (London, 1887.)
5. *National Insurance Necessary and Possible.* Two Lectures by the Rev. W. MOORE EDE. (London, 1889.)
6. *Thrift and Independence, a Word for Working-Men.* By the Rev. CANON BLACKLEY. (London, 1885.)

THERE is no single question, apart from such as are distinctly political, which is, at root, of such vital national importance, and which is rapidly growing into such prominence, as the extent of English Pauperism; an evil in itself, and magnified, to the eye of all careful observers, and of many anxious ones, by the contrast it presents to the vast aggregate wealth and affluence of our nation. And there is no class of men in our country whom this social evil touches more closely than the clergy of England; no class by their nature and profession more bound to its thoughtful consideration; no class by their special duties so certain to be cognizant of its facts, or better qualified by their social position, between the highest and the lowest of the nation, to estimate fairly the means suggested for its remedy. If the clergy, by education and association, hold a certain touch with the highest classes in the land, their work, in far the greatest part, is, or ought to be, amongst the poor, and circumstances bring them continually so painfully face to face with the material misery of their fellow-men, that, even were

their religion less earnest and less vital than it is, their touched humanity would make them naturally forward in seeking the material bettering of their fellow-man's condition.

Of course, the common accusation, as false as it is familiar, may be brought against them that, under the circumstances of their work, sentiment is apt with them to usurp the throne of common sense ; that they are impulsive, impracticable, and 'not business men.' There never was, we believe, a popular delusion less justified. Business man or not, the parish clergyman is by law the chairman of each parish vestry in the kingdom ; in most cases, unfortunately for himself, saddled with the keeping, certainly almost always with the collection of, and the responsibility for, funds contributed in his parish church for charity and educational purposes ; and, in most cases, when he asks some responsible layman to relieve him of the burden, he finds the burden declined, with the ready excuse, 'I am the worst business man in the world,' which is the very accusation the laymen are so thoughtlessly ready to make against the class who do the work which most others leave undone.

It is no wonder, then, that we should find, as we study the history of efforts made for the understanding, the correction, and the prevention of pauperism, that clergymen have almost always taken the lead. Thomas Robert Malthus (however strangely his views are misinterpreted by modern Malthusians), our first great elucidator of the population question, on which much of the pauperism question depends, was a clergyman ; so was the famous Dr. Chalmers, who may reasonably be called the father of modern charity organization ; so is Canon Blackley, whose well-known proposals for the Prevention of Pauperism form the subject of the present paper, for the treatment of which in this Review we hold the foregoing considerations to afford an ample justification, should any such be required.

Canon Blackley's proposal was first published in the *Nineteenth Century* review for November 1878, and has now been over ten years before the public. A few words as to its basis, its character, and the history of the movement it inaugurated, will be of service to our consideration of the subject.

The article referred to was based upon a consideration of the injury done by our existing Poor Law system, which, as most students of the subject are ready to admit, really causes more destitution than it was established to relieve, inasmuch as the knowledge that the Poor Law will compel all provided

men to pay for the sustenance of all destitute ones, materially encourages large numbers, who would otherwise provide for themselves, to cultivate destitution in order to be provided for by others without effort of their own.

The essay, laying down as axioms the duty of every man, if able, to provide against destitution, the general present neglect of this duty, the failure of all existing remedies proposed for this neglect, proceeded to propound, as a real remedy, the compulsion of able persons to make in early life provision against destitution in sickness and old age by paying (in a lump sum, or by instalments) during three years, from the age of eighteen onwards, contributions to a national club or friendly society, so as to make them for the rest of their lives independent of poor rates and safe against pauperism, giving them a just claim, bought with their own money, to a weekly payment in sickness and a weekly pension in old age.

Now, it is perfectly obvious that, if it could be carried out, such a plan must in course of time all but extinguish, in the case of persons blessed with a healthy vigorous youth, the possibility of future pauperism, and thus extinguish the misery of the pauper's doom, except in the cases, happily extremely rare, of persons physically never able to carry out the ordinary duty of man while he lives on earth, namely, the earning of his own living. To provide and secure independently to every able-bodied man and woman through labouring life a fund sufficient in sickness to raise him above the need of charity, public or private, and in old age, when power to work is past, the means of restful existence without labour, would necessarily place the member of such an institution on a pedestal of self-support from which he could never descend, whether willing or otherwise, would not only secure the material of existence, but would also sweeten the whole course of life, by the removal of an ever-menacing anxiety for the future, and save the manly character of all our labouring class from the terrible deterioration which the present sole dependence upon eventual poor-law relief must produce on the mind of each one who has power to look a month forward from the present moment. A man known to be always secure in sickness of even so small a provision as eight shillings per week, and of a pension in old age of half that money, could never acquire that terrible qualification, absolute destitution, for relief from rates (which after all is no true charity), and he would always both be and feel himself an independent and provided man. For such a provision, it is plain, though

small in itself, is far more than the most liberal parish relief which can be given to the destitute under our existing laws.

Though the smallness of this offered benefit is made an objection to the proposal, the objection is fully answered by the fact that this will far more liberally, while independently, provide for men's needs than the present compulsory system of rate-relief, and by remembering that the provision compulsorily of any sum at all for the purpose named must necessarily be a minimum one, while persons desirous and willing to make a larger provision may do so by additional voluntary contributions to any existing sound friendly society. In short, to require compulsorily the provision of a sum larger than absolutely needful for the poorest wage-earner, would needlessly overburden him and weaken the main justification of the measure, namely, the plain justice of making each man provide for himself.

The plan proposes that the contributions be collected from members of the provided classes by the ordinary tax-collectors; from wage-earners, by deduction of weekly instalments from their wages; that the funds be payable and the benefits receivable at every Post Office; and that all owners of property and earners of wages, after reaching the age of eighteen, be under compulsion to make their payments during three years, or such longer time as completes any deficient portion of their contribution; that the payment once completed they be free during lifetime from any further contribution, and entitled in sickness which prevents wage-earning to eight shillings weekly; and that after the age of sixty-five or seventy (as may be fixed) they shall be entitled to a life pension of four shillings a week.

Such is the general outline of Canon Blackley's scheme, which it is hardly possible to think any reasonable being, except from motives of personal interest, could feel justified in opposing. Before considering the objections offered, which, we may premise, proved almost exclusively to be on matters of detail, and not on matters of principle, we may point out a few of the less immediately perceptible points of advantage offered by the scheme.

There are, firstly, the relative cheapness of the provisions to be made, as compared with any similar provision made by any existing friendly societies whatever.

For existing societies, consisting entirely of voluntary contributions, being joined (practically) only by persons who in time of sickness intend to draw from the funds, require of necessity a much larger contribution than each member of the

popu  
must  
draw  
assim  
wron  
makin  
this a  
of the  
be en  
tract  
(rich  
that l  
the si  
earnin  
person  
share  
qualif  
provis  
contra  
wrongs  
taxing  
tion re  
wage-  
men, o  
earner  
Till it  
claim  
fellow-  
same s  
to pay  
tage th  
is at  
money

Cu  
called  
we have  
member  
declare  
actual  
principle,  
but we  
surance  
answer,  
classes,  
cheaper

population needs to make for a National Fund, to which all must contribute, but from which all would not be entitled to draw. This alleged advantage, it has been often asserted, assimilates the principle of National Insurance to that very wrong of the Poor Law which it is supposed to remedy—the making of the provided classes pay for the unprovided. But this accusation is a mistake. It arises from misinterpretation of the terms of contract proposed. Every contributor would be entitled to draw pension on and after reaching the contract age, which is the pension contract ; every contributor (rich or poor) would be entitled to draw sick pay, on showing that he was *prevented by sickness from earning wages*, which is the sick-pay contract ; but as many will be sick who are not earning wages or dependent on them for a livelihood, such persons will not draw sick pay under their contract, and the share they contribute to the sick pay, *so long as they are not qualified by their contract to draw it*, will go to cheapen the provision of those who in sickness fulfil the condition of their contract ; in fact, of the wage-earners proper. It has been wrongly assumed that this is equivalent to a poor rate as taxing the provided for the unprovided. And this assumption rests on the failure to recognize that provided men and wage-earners are susceptible of change in condition. Many men, once wealthy, come down to pauperism ; many wage-earners who prosper in the world cease to be wage-earners. Till it be impossible for a provided man, once affluent, to claim rate-relief, he cannot complain of having to secure his fellow-men from the possible burden of his support at the same small cost which the wage-earner is to be called upon to pay ; and he gets for his contribution the tangible advantage that if he lose his fortune, and have to earn his living, he is at least secured against actual pauperism by his own money.

Curiously enough great stress has been laid on the so-called pauperizing tendency of a sick pay insurance such as we have described, by opponents of National Insurance among members of existing societies ; and some of these seem to declare that it would injure their independence to receive an actual money advantage so conferred ; though, on this principle, they ought logically to refuse honorary subscriptions ; but we have not so far heard the advocates of National Insurance meet that objection by what seems to us the obvious answer, which is this. If the payments of the provided classes, many of whom *may* never be paupers, obviously cheapen the general cost of sick pay to the actual wage-earn-

ing class by (say) 30 per cent., and if such cheapening be really felt a degradation by any *bond fide* wage-earner, let him claim to pay the full cost instead of the reduced one, and receive an insurance card of a different colour from the common, to show his praiseworthy (but, we will still expect, very exceptional) spirit of independence. Such a method as this will satisfy the difficulty, if it really exist, or silence the cavil, if only cavil it be.

And it is not only in the very tangible and appreciable direction of cheapness (which is estimated, we believe, at a capital value of between five and six pounds) that the plan possesses a manifest advantage. It not only enables, but requires, the payments to be made in early life, and secured for all life, which is practically undone under any existing voluntary system. As far as it goes, the compulsory plan secures a provision which no voluntary plan can possibly do. Not that the tables of an ordinary society are necessarily insufficient to secure the benefits, but that the contributor to the very best of such societies cannot secure his power of continuing his contributions and of retaining his membership. The burden of a lifelong periodical payment under present conditions multiplies with the increase of all necessary expenditure connected with marriage and the bringing up of a family, and, further on in life, with the decrease of wage-earning power as the man grows old. And this with the inevitable result that multitudes of members of good societies are forced by circumstances to lapse from membership altogether by inability to continue contributions. It is not denied, we believe, that something like 25,000 lapse from each of the great affiliated orders, the Odd Fellows and Foresters, every year. So far as regards the benefits assured by the National Insurance no lapse could possibly occur, as the money must be all paid up in advance in early life, when the burden of contribution is smallest in proportion to the later necessities of expenditure consequent on marriage. We wonder whether any friendly society member 50 years old would be really sorry to have been compelled in his youth to have made this provision.

Another advantage of the scheme—which, though we do not find it prominently handled by its advocates, we understand has been laid much stress upon by its author—is the social effect which its adoption would have upon what is now becoming a more and more perplexing difficulty. We refer to the matter of too early and improvident marriage.

The extremely early age of marriage and the generally

reckless manner in which its responsibilities are embraced are admittedly due to the action of a poor law which, however unintentionally, teaches the doctrine, especially injurious in early life, that, in the last resource, every difficulty of maintenance, not only for the individual man, but for as many human beings as he chooses to propagate, must be solved by the compulsory taxation of others than those primarily, naturally, and morally responsible. This grave wrong in policy can never be abrogated by any laws restricting further than at present the age of legal marriage. In our country, we believe, this is fixed at the ridiculous period of fourteen years for males and thirteen years for females. Any law to alter this would practically simply encourage the far worse evil of concubinage. But if the establishment of an universal system of early self-provision were introduced, it would carry its natural corollary that a man, even if himself insured, should be liable, from his earnings, to effect or to complete the insurance of an uninsured wife ; his field of choice would obviously be limited, to a great extent, to partners who had already completed their own provision ; while the risk of encouraging concubinage by limiting marriage (not by constraint of law, but of policy) would be met by applying the same rule to all males against whom affiliation orders were issued.

Not much need be said here on the subject of the general initial objection made against the proposal as being compulsory ; the Falstaffian argument which may be adduced against the enactment of any law whatever, and which, in its broadest sense, is answered by a well-remembered statement made by Canon Blackley in treating the subject at the Leicester Church Congress. ‘What,’ he asked, ‘is the passing of any law whatever by any nation but the definition of each citizen’s civil duty? And what is the execution of any law whatever but the compulsion of each citizen to do his civil duty thus defined?’ But still stronger answer is given in the particular case, by his statement that the establishment of a compulsory insurance is only the introduction of a new and fair compulsion in correction of an old and unfair one.

‘Compulsory Providence’ (we quote the leaflet of the National Providence League, entitled *What is National Insurance?*) ‘is no new thing. *England has had Compulsory Providence for centuries*, and the nation has “stood it” in a way that no other nation on the face of the earth would submit to. For our present law provides for the wasteful—that is Providence—and does it by compelling the thrifty to pay rates for them—that is Compulsory Providence ; and the sin of it is that the compulsion is all exercised on the wrong men, which

is unjust. On the other hand, National Insurance would provide for all—that, too, is Providence—and do it by compelling each man to pay for himself—that, too, is Compulsory Providence; but it would exercise the compulsion on the right men, instead of the wrong ones, which is just and fair.'

Though these statements sound like truisms now, they were almost new discoveries ten years ago, when this agitation was first set on foot, and their promulgation has had a remarkable result in practically extinguishing the objection to any measure of national insurance based on its compulsory nature. For, given that the thing itself is desirable, there is nothing more obvious than that no measure of the sort could conceivably be successful unless universally applied, or be universally applied without compulsion.

Far more considerable difficulties lay in the allegations that the amount required as contribution was too small for security, too large for contribution, too costly to collect, and that for these reasons the proposed measure would be impossible to enact. It was reserved for one single class, those namely members of, and interested in, existing friendly societies, to assert, as they practically do, that the extent of voluntary independence at the present time makes it quite unnecessary to introduce new legislation for that prevention of pauperism at which the National Insurance proposal aims.

As to the first of these objections, we may readily admit that the sum of 10*l.*, first stated by Canon Blackley as requisite (and this always as a merely arguable and conjectural amount, subject to corrections based on experience), however sufficient it might have been thought ten years ago, cannot reasonably be regarded as sufficient at the present time. For as the provision of the necessary amount, for the entire pension fund, as well as for much the greater part of the sick pay, would have nearly fifty years to accumulate at compound interest before distribution, the lower rate of interest obtainable now than ten years ago would, no doubt, make the accumulation from that initial sum too small.<sup>1</sup> This reasonable consideration, however, need only lengthen the duration of compulsion, and cannot be thought in any sense to diminish the value of the scheme if otherwise approved.

The power of contribution is the next point to consider, and really seems to admit of small doubt if it be regarded, as the proposers always have done, as a matter of management

<sup>1</sup> The cost of a Post Office pension, such as proposed, from seventy years of age, was, for six years after Canon Blackley's proposition, only 5*l. os. 10d.* In 1884 it was raised to 7*l. 11s. 8d.*

rather  
the av  
ordinar  
some  
be rec  
secure  
thing  
to go  
this is  
answe  
of coll  
in the  
the ha  
these  
would  
by in  
emplo  
be co  
and as  
choice  
should  
tribut  
enorm  
the pr  
far mo  
one of  
and so  
vision

The  
answer  
of the  
ticabili  
whelm  
broach  
larger  
that a  
earners  
through  
obtain  
ment, a  
Fund.

This  
of mer  
blishing

Ha

rather than of possibility. For nothing is plainer than that, if the average working man maintains a wife and family on the ordinary man's wage, the unmarried working man can spare some shillings a week (while only fifteen pence a week would be required) during three years' time to render his whole life secure from the possibility of eventual pauperism. That the thing may be difficult, if each young earner of wages be required to go and make his weekly payment, is quite conceivable; but this is entirely obviated by that condition of the plan which answers the second objection we touch, that of the difficulty of collection. For this is met by putting the duty of collection in the hands of employers, instead of taking the money from the hands of young and often thoughtless wage-earners. If these latter receive all their wages to spend, their contributions would be indeed impracticable to collect; but if it be made by inevitable deductions from wages required to be paid in by employers of all the uninsured, the money must automatically be collected whenever the contributor is earning wages; and as, in order to live, he must earn wages, he would have no choice whatever as to whether or no the legal deductions should be contributed. Another aspect of the power of contribution need merely be indicated by considering the enormous sum spent by many of the poorest wage-earners at the present time in beer and tobacco, not to mention other far more reasonable luxuries, the indulgence, however, in no one of which can equal in its blessing the moral satisfaction and social advantage of possessing a safe and independent provision against eventual pauperism.

The answers to the foregoing objections go far towards answering the common one, based on a hasty over-estimation of the force of any or all of these, namely, the utter impracticability of any National Insurance whatever. The overwhelming reply to this is, that since the proposal was first broached in this country the subject has been taken up in a larger one, with much greater population than our own, and that a National Compulsory Insurance Sicknes Fund for all earners of wages has been for some years successfully initiated throughout the whole German Empire, and will in a few weeks obtain its necessary and natural complement in the establishment, amidst general public approval, of an universal Pension Fund.

This great existing fact supplies the fullest possible refutation of mere theoretical opinions as to the impracticability of establishing any system of the kind in our own country.

Having so far treated the proposal in its broader features,

and examined the main general advantages and general difficulties urged by its advocates or its opponents, we proceed to summarize the history of the movement and its present position.

Canon Blackley's first article on the subject excited so much immediate interest that a society, 'The National Providence League,' was very soon formed to promote the study and advocacy of its proposals. Of that League the late universally-lamented Earl of Shaftesbury was the president, and took the chair at some important public meetings. Under its auspices Canon Blackley, the Rev. E. H. McKnight, and the present Earl of Winchelsea, with many others in a less prominent degree, attended and addressed public meetings of all classes, to explain and advocate the proposal, and the League still continues its good work. Up to the present time it has been stated that between three and four hundred public meetings have been held, and the subject discussed in every part of the kingdom, and that in only one of all those meetings (and then from a political cause unconnected with the League) have its advocates failed to secure a favourable (and in most instances an unanimous) vote.

In the year 1885 a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider the subject, and sat till the unexpected dissolution of Parliament which took place in the summer of that year. The committee was reappointed in the following year, and, singularly enough, met with exactly the same fate. Again reappointed in 1887, but, as may be supposed, with but few members remaining who had heard the chief portion of the evidence, a Report was issued, of which the following extract from communications to the *Times* newspaper of December 2 and 29, 1887, gives the following account :—

'The Report, in fact, pronounces against one portion of Canon Blackley's proposal—namely, the compulsory provision of sick pay by all persons—as entirely impracticable at the present time. With regard to the other, and really most important portion—namely, the compulsory provision, in youth, of a small pension receivable in old age—it gives a very different decision. It recommends certain measures, presently to be noticed, from which a great favourable advance in public opinion on this subject is to be expected; and, while declaring the compulsory pension proposal free from many objections urged and allowed against that for sick pay, the Committee go on, instead of rejecting both, to conclude their Report as to the pension proposal in the following pregnant sentence: "Your Committee are, however, disposed to wait for the further development of public opinion, which they believe would ensue upon the carrying out

of the  
obligation  
thus intro-  
probation  
in its  
old age  
these  
from

“  
selves,  
one,  
Black-  
vigore  
desira-  
sory,  
insura-  
contri-  
which  
fluctu-  
regis-  
the se-  
obliga-

part  
sion  
stren-  
‘friend-  
affilia-  
the F-  
tions  
politi-  
of su-  
solvinc  
own i-  
nation  
let al-  
the in-  
vehem-  
order:  
troubl-  
mend-

W  
some  
Socie-  
of the

of their recommendations before advising the adoption of a general obligatory system of superannuated pay." If, in a word, the Report thus recommends certain important measures as preparatory to the introduction of an obligatory pension system which would in all human probability prevent three-fourths of all existing pauperism (especially in its saddest and most melancholy aspect—namely, the destitution of old age) there is abundant reason to congratulate Canon Blackley and the National Providence League, formed for the promulgation of these views, on the distinct advance to their cause which must result from such a striking declaration.

'The recommendations of the Committee, besides being themselves of very great value, are specially noteworthy as touching every one, vital points in the whole subject of thrift for which Canon Blackley has been himself probably the first, and certainly the most vigorous, advocate. They are as follows :—First, that it is highly desirable that the Legislature, which has made education compulsory, should cause instruction in sound principles of thrift and insurance to form part of that education ; secondly, that a *minimum* contribution should be fixed for all new friendly societies, below which they shall not be entitled to registration, and that ascertained fluctuations in their funds shall be rectified, on pain of suspension of registration ; and, thirdly, that for all persons hereafter appointed to the service of the Crown, contribution to a pension fund shall be made obligatory.'

Briefly said, the Committee reported against the sick-pay part of the scheme, but more or less favourably as to the pension part. They admittedly 'deferred very largely' to the strenuously urged opposition of representatives of the so-called 'friendly society interest,' or rather those of the two great affiliated orders of friendly societies, the Odd Fellows and the Foresters. We do not wonder, for these large organizations have, not unnaturally, great opportunities for exercising political power. We shall measure presently the qualifications of such organizations, however excellent in themselves, for solving the question of pauperism, or for claiming that, in their own individual interest, that question, most pressing as regards national interests and morals, must be severely and for ever let alone ; but for the moment we may admit that, adding to the initial practical difficulties of the proposed legislation the vehement opposition, whether selfish or not, of the affiliated orders, it was hardly to be expected that any immediate introduction of a compulsory sick-pay scheme could be recommended by the Committee.

With this concession we proceed to place before our readers some means of judging how far the leaders of the Friendly Society interest can justify their claim to impede the progress of the National Insurance cause. Their arguments, in fact,

amount to a claim that their system and organization are so complete and comprehensive as to render any further legislation not only unjust to themselves but unnecessary for the country. And here we may note in passing that we limit ourselves to this claim as put forward by the affiliated orders of Odd Fellows and Foresters ; we leave out of view the lower class of friendly societies, whose general condition is admitted, and has been officially certified, to be bad and unsound, in favour of whose operations not one word was said in the Committee, and on whose behalf no one ventured to tender a single witness in the investigation. The argument of the leading representatives of the societies we have named assumes, firstly, the wide statement that existing aids to thrift are sufficient for the needs of the time ; secondly, that their own organizations render all new legislation unnecessary ; and, thirdly, that their own (supposed to be) vested interests must not be interfered with.

As to existing aids to thrift being sufficient for the prevention of pauperism, the answer is perfectly easy. Savings-banks (Post Office or trustee), facilities for investment, Government annuities, &c., all excellent in their way, are only useful to voluntary practisers of thrift, but do not touch in the smallest degree the wastefulness of the wasteful, the very root of our monstrous pauperism, which it is the good aim of National Insurance to prevent. No facilities for, no extension of, voluntary thrift among the thrifty will protect the wasteful from the pauper's doom, or deliver the thrifty themselves from bearing, as at present, the unjust burden of the wastrel's maintenance. Therefore, supposing the existing friendly societies we have named to be thoroughly solvent (a point we shall presently recur to), they cannot in any conceivable way do the work that is wanted. These organizations each claim to secure about 600,000 members from want in sickness and to provide funds for burial. But they do not provide for pensions in old age, the thing most needed of all in the matter, since Canon Blackley gave the Committee in his evidence good grounds, as yet entirely undisputed, for inferring that 45 per cent. of the whole population reaching sixty years of age *die as paupers!* Nor can any society induce men to provide voluntary pensions. The use made of the 'Post Office Deferred Annuities' was admitted by a Post Office official, in his evidence before the Committee, to be 'contemptible.' The Odd Fellows themselves established (since the mootings of the National Insurance proposals) a scheme for providing their members with voluntary prepaid

pensi  
time  
selve  
sions  
comp  
show

T  
has b  
socie  
be pr  
a nat  
friend  
solver  
will f  
the A  
Can  
that (  
are g  
their  
stater  
true.

'T  
the C  
by its  
still te  
shows  
the U  
about  
averag

N  
the c  
and 1  
tions.  
count  
argum  
them  
organ  
desire  
Com  
to in  
really  
seem  
to pe  
to bl  
Fello

pensions, and testified before the Committee that in two years' time only 4 men out of 600,000 had chosen to avail themselves of the facility offered. Therefore, as far as old age pensions are concerned, a compulsory insurance cannot be said to compete with existing societies at all, and this is, as we have shown, by far the most vital part of the whole question.

There remains the sick pay, and as regards it, the question has been often asked : 'Why not utilize the existing good societies for this purpose?' The answer is that, though they be presumably good, they are not good enough for working a national scheme. For if the law compelled men to join any friendly society, it must practically guarantee that society's solvency for forty or fifty years to come. And to do so we will further show (without any desire to depreciate or injure the Affiliated Orders) to be a financial impossibility. Even Canon Blackley has, we understand, expressed the opinion that (in each case as a whole) the Odd Fellows and Foresters are *generally* sound ; but certainly not sound enough to justify their receiving a national guarantee, as long as the following statement given in evidence before the Committee, remains true. We quote again from the *Times*, Dec. 29, 1887 :

'The Manchester Unity of Odd Fellows (much of whose work the Committee deservedly speaks of with commendation) discloses, by its latest published valuation (that of 1880, published in 1884), a still terrible amount of deficiency. An examination of this valuation shows, roughly speaking, that while rather less than 40 per cent. of the Unity's lodges had a surplus of assets over liabilities, averaging about 140*l.* per lodge, more than 60 per cent. show deficiencies averaging about 400*l.* per lodge.'

No greater mistake has been made in the whole history of the cause, than that of regarding its promoters as opponents, and potential destroyers, of good voluntary thrift organizations. The advocates of National Insurance, so far from disowning membership in existing societies, found their arguments on the need of requiring the thrifless to make for themselves the very same sort of provision which these thrifty organizations secure ; and, so far from being justly thought desirous to injure these organizations, the Parliamentary Committee itself reported the failure of the friendly societies to indicate any point in which National Insurance could really injure existing sound friendly societies. Indeed, it seems quite obvious that a compulsory insurance applied only to persons as they reach eighteen years would not touch, even to bless, any but a very minute fraction of the mass of Odd Fellows, although such a measure, by placing, at twenty-one

years of age, all the thriftless, who now never join a society at all, on a pedestal of, at least, minimum independence against pauperism, would bring a vast multitude up to the very doors of good friendly societies for the provision of additional benefits which National Insurance would not compel men to provide ; yet such is the sensitiveness of self-interest, at all times and in all organizations, that the cause has endured for several years past the most violent, and sometimes unworthy, abuse from their publications.<sup>1</sup> Still there are many among friendly society men who cannot any longer allow mere prejudice or clamour to obscure the fact that a means is offered for making part of the provision they now do of their own accord, more early, more cheaply, and more securely than they are doing ; completing it at twenty-one years of age, instead of leaving the members to the precarious chance of being able to contribute every month throughout all life ; giving it for two-thirds of the present cost ; and giving with it, to each contributor, an infallible national guarantee. Such members ask themselves :

' Are we to oppose this measure and shut out, not only ourselves, but the whole mass of the nation which does not join us, from these immense advantages, solely because their conference is to be compulsory ? Are we wise to object to a compulsion which only does better for us, and all, the most needed part of the very things we are striving to do for ourselves alone ? Can it be that, as we are told in so many claptrap speeches, our independence will be destroyed by this only measure which at last proposes to perfectly secure our independence ? '

Many ask themselves these questions now, and common sense decides the average answer in one single way. But many see still further than this, that such a measure will not only benefit their thrifty selves, but their unthrifty fellows, and regenerate wasteful, miserable millions with the possession, even if not with the spirit, of self-purchased independence. They see, through the vista of one single generation, an England in which, instead of half our race looking forward to eventual pauperism as a phantom to embitter existence, all men shall be free from its fear as well as its possibility, and they say :

' If this be a hope to brighten the darkness of our nation's prospects, the raising of the lowest, the helping of the poorest, the ennobling of the meanest, then even if National Insurance, which cannot make Odd Fellowship less secure, tend to make it less extensive, it

<sup>1</sup> Notably is this the case as regards Mr. Wilkinson's pamphlet, written avowedly in the 'Odd Fellows' interest and distributed by its agents.

will  
mind

tion,  
on the  
lows  
artic  
out o  
the s  
to be  
show  
The

amou  
porta  
an ele  
I qui  
quest  
not ir  
" The  
see a  
interes  
The c  
dency  
when  
of frie  
ness a  
not fo  
raised  
so-cal  
not m  
can be  
Law  
habits  
meet  
the w  
only e  
mere

The  
by Pa  
on th  
membr  
amina  
of spa  
length

<sup>1</sup> T  
1885.

will make England more happy, and no mean, selfish thought in our minds shall hinder this greater good from outweighing the less.'

Of course it will be said, all this is very fine as declamation, but we need proof before assuming any changed opinion on the point, and this we proceed to give. In the *Odd Fellows' Magazine* for October 1885 the editor published an article containing the substance of communications from some out of many eminent Odd Fellows, who had written to him on the subject, pointing out the great danger of disunion likely to be caused throughout the organization by the opposition shown in his paper to all proposals for National Insurance. The writer of one letter says:—

'At present the majority of our members require a considerable amount of educating on this subject to fully grasp its great importance. If any precipitate action should be taken, I am afraid an element of discord will be sown in our midst, much to be regretted. I quite believe a fair number of our best members are in favour of the question being brought within the range of practicability. That does not imply full acceptance of Canon Blackley's or any other scheme. "The principle is accepted." For my own part I have yet failed to see a single logical argument showing us that it is against the best interests of the community that National Insurance should be adopted. The one most used is that its adoption will have a degrading tendency and will pauperize. I fail to see how it can possibly do this when its great aim is self-support and independence. We members of friendly societies accept the principle of making provision for sickness and old age. "If a right thing for the individual to do," why not for all? By its influence the whole standard of life would be raised. Instead of a minority being degraded, a vast majority of the so-called lower classes will be levelled up. It is often said you cannot make people thrifty by Act of Parliament. Granted. But they can be helped in a great measure by wise laws. By our present Poor Law system we do exactly the opposite by encouraging unthrifty habits. Any measure which savours of State socialism is sure to meet with violent opposition from a number of persons to whom the word Socialism acts as a bugbear. If these worthy people will only examine the measures on their merits, and not take fright at a mere word, the ranks of the opposition will be considerably thinned.'

The next letter published was a vigorous and acute attack by Past Provincial Grand Master Sinclair, of Glasgow, both on the evidence given and on the authority assumed by those members of the order who had presented themselves for examination before the Parliamentary Committee. The limits of space make it impossible to quote Mr. Sinclair's letter at length, but if persons interested in the subject will read it,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The whole article appears in the *Odd Fellows' Magazine* for October 1885. It is reprinted in the *National Provident Reporter* for October

and at the same time compare with it the vague evidence, which it so justly and trenchantly criticizes, to be found in the Committee's Report, they will not wonder at the change of opinion amongst the Odd Fellows to which we have referred, and which is indicated by the insertion of these remarkable letters in the *Odd Fellows' Magazine* by an always persistently hostile editor. But we have not to do with indications only. Canon Blackley stated in his evidence that he attended by invitation a meeting of the Past Grand Masters' Lodge of Odd Fellows at Southampton, and addressed them on the subject. About seventy of these leading men were in the room. He was entirely unaware that there was to be a debate held or resolution proposed. But vigorous discussion followed his address, in the course of which several speakers avowed that they had been among his most vehement opponents until they had studied the scheme, and had now become enthusiastic supporters of it, having thrashed out the subject carefully in their separate lodges, and become convinced of its utility. As a result, to his great surprise and gratification, a resolution in the following terms was unanimously passed : ' Resolved, that, having heard Canon Blackley's scheme of Compulsory National Insurance, this meeting is of opinion that it is practicable, and trusts the Legislature will take the matter in hand at the earliest possible convenient time.' Referring to this fact, Mr. Wilkinson, who was not present, ventures to assert that Canon Blackley ' snatched a favourable vote, owing to his eloquence in confusing the main issues,' and to the fact that ' no one in a position to answer him was present.' The vote was drafted, proposed, and unanimously passed by the *Past Masters themselves*, seconded by Mr. Walton, Past Grand Master of the whole Order.

Another important consideration is that neither the position held nor the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee by the chief official of the Friendly Societies Registry necessarily entitles his opinions against National Insurance to any special weight on the question. It is with no desire in any way to reflect upon the chief registrar, who is, we believe, an altogether estimable gentleman, that we offer, not merely a warning, but reasons for the warning, against allowing his admittedly crude conjectures on the subject (which are not 1886, which can be obtained on application from the Hon. Secretary, National Providence League, Lancaster House, Savoy, Strand. It is only fair to add that Mr. Wilkinson declares Mr. Sinclair's opinions to be repudiated by his Society, a thing to be expected : but he does not suggest that his Society attempted to refute them, which is far more to the purpose.

proof  
of an  
neces  
by a  
the e  
friend  
on the

on the  
admit  
on tha  
from t  
by sta  
hands  
Canon  
dence,  
concer  
cordia

TH  
of any  
an aut  
ing, is  
allowe  
trover  
fessedl  
very d  
the ca  
vague  
all wh  
who he  
mittee.  
followi

' 14  
break  
much m

' 14  
Divide

' 14  
money.

' 14  
have b  
some o  
records  
without.

' 14  
flicted i

VOL.

proofs) more weight than they are entitled to in the balancing of an exact opinion concerning the proposals. That this is necessary will appear from the following extract of a letter by a publicist on this subject, who says: 'I had in my mind the evidence given by Mr. Ludlow, the veteran registrar of friendly societies, and undoubtedly the greatest living authority on the subject.'

That Mr. Ludlow, as chief registrar, may be an authority on the subject of registered friendly societies we can readily admit, without admitting him to be any authority whatever on that of National Insurance, as his own statement extracted from that very evidence will show. For he began (Ans. 1411) by stating that, until the evidence taken was put into his hands a few days before, 'he had not paid much attention to Canon Blackley's plans, which he chiefly knew from that evidence, *not having previously thought that it was a matter which concerned his office.*' A point of view in which, by the way, we cordially agree with him.

This shows very plainly Mr. Ludlow's own clear disavowal of any claim, *qua* registrar of friendly societies, to be thought an authority on National Insurance, which, on his own showing, is a matter as plainly outside his functions as he had allowed it during seven years of pretty vigorous public controversy to remain outside his cognizance; though a confessedly cursory examination qualified him to give not only a very decided opinion against it, but also (most fortunately for the cause itself) to offer reasons for his opinion, the singularly vague and unconvincing character of which reasons will strike all who read with care, as it certainly struck most of those who heard with attention, the evidence he offered to the Committee. We draw the special attention of our readers to the following passages in Mr. Ludlow's evidence:—

'1470. Do you find that these registered societies frequently break up?—Yes, pretty often, *nearly as often because they have too much money as because they have too little.*

'1471. And when they have too much money, what do they do?—Divide it.

'1472. But what is their object in breaking up?—To handle the money.

'1473. Is it within your knowledge whether these persons who have belonged to such a friendly society start a new one, or join some other one?—I cannot say. Very often they do. From our records very nearly as many societies break up with a surplus as break without.

'1474. Have you not known several cases of hardship being inflicted upon poor men who have paid for many years to a society

which breaks up and is unable to pay the benefits promised?—No doubt there are cases of hardship.'

Most persons, from reading these sentences, would suppose that as many registered friendly societies were sound as unsound; but a more utterly misleading statement was never made than that italicized. It may be true in words qualified by the phrase 'from our records' in answer 1473. What Mr. Ludlow really means is not to compare the number of societies having a surplus with those having deficiencies, but only the number of applications for authoritative dissolution of societies *through the agency of the chief registrar*. It is perfectly plain that a society having money to divide can only legally dissolve in the manner appointed by law; but just as plain that a rotten society, when it at last smashes to pieces, vanishes into thin air without troubling the Registry at all. It is no man's interest (especially in the utter and proven helplessness of the Registry to prevent immeasurable injury to the poor) to waste good money, even to the value of one penny stamp, in informing the Registry, or in applying to the office for a dissolution order, when the last sixpence of funds has been expended and the club-box is closed for ever. It dies out; it makes no official returns; sends no new valuation; it disappears; but no proof of the non-committal of murders can be drawn from the statement that no murderers have paid for placing their victims' deaths in the obituary of the *Times*.

So very far is the true state of things (which gives the strongest argument for National Insurance) from bearing the rose-coloured light by which Mr. Ludlow's sentence irradiates it, or from countenancing any idea whatever of the number of solvent societies equalling insolvent ones, that we wonder Mr. Ludlow, had he really read the evidence submitted to him before his examination, should have failed to guard his reply against all misapprehension in this respect. For in that evidence Canon Blackley had made, *on the strength of the last returns on the subject, published by Mr. Ludlow's own office, and under his own supervision*, a statement so startlingly contradictory to the sense of his words as should have made him pause, if only for breath, before their utterance. The Canon said, as showing the farcical impotence of the Friendly Societies Act of 1875 to protect members of societies from failure, that the official actuary in Mr. Ludlow's own office reported nearly five out of every six registered societies that come under his cognizance to be financially unsound. But this is an old and sad story. He showed the Committee further, however, that, from

the  
soc  
for  
be  
Mr.  
near  
as h  
Rep  
clea  
one  
tion  
orga  
at h

arra  
the  
met  
have  
the g  
obvi

V  
(que  
his s  
State  
cases  
been  
their  
mom  
loose  
of the  
and,  
them

O  
closed  
1478  
whose  
of the  
eyes op  
but w  
that th

1 M  
stateme  
made n  
further  
not as d

the detailed return by the official actuary of the affairs of every society returned by him in his Report, good reason appeared for considering *forty-six out of every forty-seven* societies to be financially insecure, so that in a general way instead of Mr. Ludlow's complacent assertion that 'registered societies nearly as often break up because they have too much money as because they have too little' being anything like exact, the Reports issued from his own office lead to the far truer, clearer, and more miserable conclusion that little more than *one in fifty* of societies which claim the privileges of registration is sound, even excluding the thousands of equally hurtful organizations too manifestly bad ever to ask for registration at his hands.<sup>1</sup>

Now Mr. Ludlow either knew or did not know this arraignment drawn from his own publications and given in the evidence submitted to him. If he knew it he should have met it in a very different way than by his answer which we have been dissecting. If he did not know it, instead of being the greatest authority on this vital matter, he is simply and obviously no authority at all.

We touch another point of his evidence. Being pressed (question 1477) as to whether the hardship to a poor man of his society becoming insolvent would not be removed by a State guarantee, he answers (if it be an answer) that 'in many cases the men who lose their money by such insolvency have been bad members of the society, who have not paid up their contributions.' As if his questioner was referring for a moment to any such men, who, by Mr. Ludlow's own singularly loose hypothesis, firstly, have voluntarily ceased to be members of the societies, and therefore are unconcerned in their collapse, and, secondly, cannot be *losers* of money which he assumes them not to have contributed!

On his questioner pressing and defining the question more closely, Mr. Ludlow answers (as may be gathered from replies 1478–1485 and 1490) by implying that most of the persons whose provision for times of sickness is lost by the collapse of their unsound societies have joined such societies *with their eyes open* to their unsoundness, and that 'volenti non fit injuria'; but when pushed with the direct inquiry (1485) 'Do you think that the country labourers really join a society knowing it to

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Frome Wilkinson is very severe on Canon Blackley for this statement. He says that the reason why so many registered societies made no returns was that *they had died out!* But surely this is going further than Canon Blackley himself, who only classed them as unsound, not as defunct.

be unsound?' instead of any direct answer, 'yes' or 'no,' to so simple a query, he replies, 'I think what they look to most is the amount of the contribution.'

We have quoted enough with regard to the Chief Registrar's evidence, so far as it touches, or rather fails to touch, the alleged vast disappointment of hope, and discouragement to thrift, wrought among our provident poor by the general badness of their societies; not one word of his evidence, though it tends to discredit, attempts to disprove the allegation, though if he had shown the slightest prospect of that legislation which he now administers correcting this crying wrong (not even within the lifetime of a generation, but in any measurable period whatever), his opinion, however optimistically based, would have been welcome.

Of course this Review is no place for a complete dissection of all Mr. Ludlow's evidence before the Parliamentary Committee; and indeed we would invite our readers—in order to judge for themselves how very far from oracular in the sense of inspiration, and how typically oracular in the sense of vagueness, these utterances are—to read the evidence over carefully a few times for themselves. But we cannot dismiss the Chief Registrar finally from notice without directing public attention to one or two of the opinions on this matter which he has been so ready to express without taking time to study the full weight of his words. On the general question of Compulsory Insurance he says (answer 1423):

'I think that, as far as Canon Blackley's scheme is concerned, it is the most extraordinary scheme ever put forward in history. He seeks to lay a burden upon a class of persons who are totally devoid of civic rights. The poll-tax is to be paid by minors who have no voice in the State. If ever there was taxation without representation this is a case. These men on entering life are to be saddled with a burden which they have no voice in speaking against,' &c.

Readers should always suspect these general appeals to history; they are very much like the typical 'everybody says,' which is a general synonym for the speaker's own single opinion; or like the newspaper common form that 'every school-boy knows' what the article-writer has just turned up for himself in the encyclopædia. Are there no burdens now, have there never been any till now, laid upon the property of minors? Does Mr. Ludlow really suppose that all property is exempt from taxation as long as its owner is under age and therefore 'has no voice in speaking against it'? That the poll-tax, as he calls it, should be paid by minors he considers 'the most extraordinary scheme that was ever put forward in

hist  
the  
just  
the  
wh

whi  
wro  
soc  
for  
tran  
auth  
Nat

any  
soci  
broad  
evid  
shoc  
The  
the  
calcu

I  
ques  
socia  
must  
societ  
paup  
indeed  
and  
advan  
habit  
you  
not  
have  
paup  
busin  
"poli  
since  
rights  
the  
tage  
truly  
take

history ;' but he has never thought that the income-tax, the highway rate, the poor rate—in short, every tax he can justly call by the name—is also paid by minors. Advocates who so readily call all history to witness ought to know better the sort of testimony history must give in such a case as this.

One more extract we must give from Mr. Ludlow's evidence, which should satisfy every one of the number who deplore the wrong done to thrifit and thrifty men by unsound friendly societies, that a person who would uphold the present system for the fantastic reason he assigns, though he be Chief Registrar of Friendly Societies, is no safe guide and no sound authority to follow in discussing a measure which, like National Insurance, puts the social blessing of the many above the very questionable theoretical advantage of the few.

In question 1487 he was asked by Mr. Rankin, 'Is there any advantage whatever in setting up or carrying on a friendly society which is not able to pay its claims ?' Nothing can be broader and clearer than the question ; nothing in the whole evidence before the Committee was more startling and more shocking than the answer : '*Yes, I think very great advantage.* The political knowledge, the habits of business, acquired by the members even of the worst friendly societies are an incalculable advantage.'

It is an obvious inference from such an answer to such a question that political knowledge is of more true value than social independence and security from destitution. But we must remember that the great mass of members of friendly societies enter them, not to become politicians, but to escape pauperism. Is it any consolation to these to say, ' You have indeed missed the independence you so perseveringly paid for, and you are paupers after all ; but you have an incalculable advantage, for now you are politicians and men of business habits.' What will the poor sufferers answer ? ' We thank you from our broken hearts for your cold comfort, but it does not mend our miserable condition ; our "business habits" have not saved us from bankruptcy of independence, and as paupers we are the one only class in this world without any business on which to exercise our business powers ; and our "political knowledge," costly as it has been, is useless, too, since as paupers we are the only folk who have no political rights on which to exercise our political knowledge.' That is the upset that would come to Mr. Ludlow's idea of the advantage of rotten friendly societies if *every member* gained these truly 'incalculable advantages,' which is the brightest view to take of his notion. But if it be the case, as it is, that *only a*

*few gain the political knowledge, while all share the social ruin, will any man say that it can be wise or right to make forty-nine paupers in order to make one politician? or think that any public position whatever can make a man who holds such opinions an authority on a question of delivering our whole class of workers from all possibility and dread of pauperism?*

A few sentences will suffice to state the conclusion on this great subject which a due regard of the considerations we have brought forward seems to justify us in forming. That such a measure as is proposed would be of infinite use; that many of the objections to it are of small moment, absolutely insignificant in proportion to its possibilities of general benefit; that it is a subject worthy of study, as a means of promoting an end altogether to be desired; these points we, and probably most of our readers, will fully admit. But still we feel that, in the main, the Parliamentary Committee was right; that existing difficulties must prevent any immediate realization of the measure in its entirety, and that there seems no hope at the present time of overcoming either the prejudice against, or the opposition to, the measure on the part of the 'Friendly Society interest.' But as the most important and pressing part of the proposal (that, namely, for pensions) has been declared by the Committee free from most of the difficulties which beset the rest, we would urge the great good which may be done by an united advocacy of the pension part of the scheme, and by leaving the sick-pay part out of view altogether, or at least for the present.

The vast mass of pauperism, and that which involves the bitterest misery to the paupers and the heaviest burden to the ratepayers, is caused by want of old age provision. Why should not the nation secure the supply of this want, which no one seems to oppose, and let the sick-pay 'take care of itself'? The adoption of such a measure would be an immense relief to the funds of existing societies, as the heaviest portion of the sickness they pay for comes in advanced age when the pensions would be available; while State compulsion of pensions could enter into competition with no existing societies, which practically provide no pensions whatever. We cannot doubt that if both parties to the discussion could be brought to confer in a friendly way upon such an arrangement the main fears which disturb the friendly society section with regard to National Insurance would be dissipated, while the great purpose of those who consider the interest of the thrifless, as well as of the provident, would be secured with mutual ease, general good-will, and universal advantage.

## SHORT NOTICES.

*The Epistles of St. John. Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative Versions, and Notes, chiefly Exegetical.* By WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Brasenose College, Oxford, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Second thousand. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.)

IT is something of a surprise to find such discourses as these in a series produced by a well-known firm of Dissenting publishers, under the editorship of a Scotch Presbyterian minister. Needless to say, the Bishop of Derry sails under no false colours. His book is decidedly polemical ; and though many different classes of persons receive his well-deserved and well-delivered blows, the polemic is mainly such as is natural to a Catholic-minded man whose work lies in Ulster. Puritanism is a form of religion for which the author has evidently little sympathy ; and perhaps still less for certain types of spiritual experimentalism which have appeared of late years in Puritan quarters. Bishop Alexander aims at no colourless compromise. He finds in the Epistles of St. John many opportunities of setting forth a dogmatical, a sacramental, a ceremonial, a hierarchical Christianity, in those vigorous and glowing terms of which he is a master.

The book is somewhat curiously constructed. Interspersed between short 'Discourses,' appear in parallel columns sections of the Epistles in the Greek Text (Tischendorf), Vulgate, Authorised Version, Revised Version, and a frequently suggestive rendering of the Bishop's own. At intervals also occur Notes, sometimes before and sometimes after the 'Discourse' which is founded on the section ; these notes are not many in number. Several sections have Notes but no Discourses. The Discourses often remind the reader of Gratry's *Commentaire sur Saint Matthieu*, both in their relation to the sections of text—from which only a few points are chosen (somewhat, it must be owned, at random) for expository treatment—and also in form and character. We know no other book with which it can well be compared. It is not, like Archbishop Leighton's *Saint Peter*, intended mainly to draw out of the text what will supply devotional thought and inflame inward affections—though there are many passages which do ; nor is it, on the other hand, like Dr. Dale's *Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, an attempt to press home to the mind and conscience in everyday language the very meaning of the Apostle's words—though there are pages which bear comparison even with that noble book. Rather, the Epistles of St. John serve the Bishop of Derry as a basis from which to sally forth and to present us with many thoughtful and strong and trenchant and tender reflections, bearing upon modern life and thought. Upon laying the book down, the mind hardly feels that it has been listening to an 'Expositor,' so much as to one who, with a full heart and a well-stored memory, and a mind keenly alive to all the questions of the day, has

found in the Epistles of St. John sentences which light up whole regions of his own thought. As such, the book is full of value.

It would be most untrue, however, to suggest that the present volume consists of flights of soaring rhetoric which have nothing to do with the text. Perhaps Bishop Alexander was the less inclined to be strictly expository in this volume, because he has already given a connected exegesis of these Epistles in the *Speaker's Commentary*. Everywhere there are signs of true scholarship and accurate study. Aorists are aorists for the Bishop of Derry, and perfects are perfects:—

'Observe in the Greek the μὴ ἀμάρτητε, which refers to single acts, not to a continuous state—"that ye may not sin"' (p. 103).

"That is born" is the participle perfect. The force of the perfect is not simply past action, but such action lasting on in its effects. Our text, then (1 John v. 4), speaks only of those who having been born again into the kingdom continue in a corresponding condition, and unfold the life which they have received. . . . St. John is no "idolater of the immediate." Has the gift received by his spiritual children worn long and lasted well? What of the new life which should have issued from the New Birth? Regenerate in the past, are they renewed in the present? (p. 228).

The underlying secret of this feature of our Lord's character is told by Himself. "My meat is to be ever doing the will of Him that sent Me, and so when the time comes, by one great decisive act to finish His work (*ἴνα πιοῦ . . . καὶ τελεώσω*)."<sup>1</sup> All along the course of that life-walk there were smaller preludes to the great act which won our redemption—multitudinous daily little perfect epitomes of love and sacrifice, without which the crowning sacrifice would not have been what it was' (p. 127).

The same careful observation shows itself everywhere, and proves that if the Bishop had wished to make his work more pedestrian in its exegesis, he was very well qualified to do so. It will be felt, at the same time, in these extracts, how little the Bishop is enslaved or fettered by his grammatical exactness, or rather what force and confidence it gives to his teaching. The Bishop bears abundant and ungrudging testimony to the help which in these matters he has derived from Dr. Westcott.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Westcott, in his edition of the First Epistle, says that 'the substance of the Gospel (of St. John) is a commentary on the Epistle: the Epistle is (so to speak) the condensed moral and practical application of the Gospel.' 'The Gospel gives the historic revelation; the Epistle shows the revelation as it has been apprehended in the life of the Society and of the believer.'<sup>3</sup> Bishop Alexander has taken up this thought and worked it out with skill in more than one of his Discourses. He maintains with much good ground that the Epistle contains 'an abstract, a compendium of contents, at the beginning,' 'at its close a key to the plan' on which the Gospel is composed (p. 24). He shows how exactly the opening words of the Epistle refer to the various component elements in the

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting, in view of shallow criticisms often passed upon that great divine's teaching, to find Bishop Alexander speaking of 'a commentator so little mystical as Professor Westcott.'

<sup>2</sup> pp. xxx, xliv.

Gosp  
Incide  
'with  
the co  
assum  
A god  
rather  
Histo  
excell

T  
tion o  
theory  
the do  
which

This t  
how l  
He d  
heard  
is so n  
adds t  
other  
xxii, 8,  
style.'  
tullian  
dote r  
those w  
ness o  
the pri  
of Pau  
applied  
upon t  
the att  
he sh  
the wa  
expected  
Renan,  
there w  
the imp  
after re  
that ou  
possible  
again (p

In c  
and po  
Atomen  
Abuse  
'Sin un  
question  
his able

Gospel—(1) the Proemium, (2) the Discourses, (3) the Works, (4) the Incidents in which the historical Humanity was shown. The fivefold ‘witness’ in 1 John v. 6–12 seems to him to give a ‘synopsis, not of the contents of the Gospel, but of the aim and conception which it assumed in the form into which it was moulded by St. John’ (p. 27). A good part of the volume is taken up accordingly with the Gospel rather than with the Epistle. The discourse on ‘St. John’s Gospel Historical, not Ideological,’ is one which strikes us as particularly excellent.

‘The theologian,’ says the Bishop, ‘is an historian. He has no intention of sacrificing history to dogma, and no necessity for doing so. His theory, and that alone, harmonises his facts. His facts have passed into the domain of human history, and have had that evidence of witness which proves that they did so’ (p. 90).

This theme gives occasion for one of those little touches which show how lovingly the author has studied the book which he handles. He dwells on the significance of the fact that ‘that which we have heard’ stands first in St. John’s enumeration. No other Evangelist is so much occupied with the *words* of our Lord. And the Bishop adds the delicate observation that the same thing may be traced in other writings of the Apostle, and that ‘the true reading in Apoc. xxii. 8, where *hearing* stands before *seeing*, is indicative of St. John’s style.’ The Bishop has made a curious slip when he speaks of Tertullian as ‘born A.D. 90’; but he uses with excellent effect the anecdote related by Tertullian which shows ‘what, in the estimation of those who were near him in time, the Apostle thought of the lawfulness of ideological religious romance’—how St. John deposed from the priesthood the man who confessed to having composed the ‘Acts of Paul and Thecla.’ In a later discourse, ‘The Witness of Men applied to the Resurrection,’ the Bishop has some admirable remarks upon the evidence of the fact which we possess. While repudiating the attempt to work ‘by the dissecting-maps of elaborate harmonies,’ he shows the unity of the four Gospels in essential principles: (1) in the way in which they all abstain (contrary to what would have been expected *a priori*, to what was demanded alike by Celsus and by Renan, and supplied by Apocryphal Gospels) from suggesting that there was any appearance of the Risen Lord to unbelievers, (2) in the impression produced upon the witnesses. One might hope that, after reading what the Bishop of Derry has written about the theory that our Lord did not really die upon the cross, it would be impossible for Professor Huxley, or anyone else, to suggest that theory again (p. 247).

In dealing with the Epistle itself, the author gives us interesting and powerful discourses upon such subjects as the ‘Extent of the Atonement,’ ‘The World which we must not love,’ ‘The Use and Abuse of the Sense of the Vanity of the World,’ ‘Birth and Victory,’ ‘Sin unto Death.’ Many pages might be filled with discussion of questions raised in them. We would call attention, for instance, to his able defence of religious controversy (pp. 40, 41); his identifica-

tion of the ancient Docetism with the cultus of 'the Idea of Christ' as learned by George Eliot from Strauss (p. 46); his proof of the unsatisfying nature of such an idea not embodied in a historical career (pp. 47, 119). The Bishop brings out very finely how the force of Christianity as a missionary religion springs out of the 'universality' of Christ's human nature (pp. 111, 112); how the New Testament takes a far more cheerful view of the transitoriness of the world than was possible under the Old (p. 154); how fixity and progressive development are compatible in the Christian Church (pp. 173 foll.); how grave study is the usual condition of true inspiration (p. 264).

We may cull a sentence or two which shows his power of summing up much thought in few words :

'There is no real Christianity in taking black views, and speaking bitter things, about the human society to which we belong, and the human nature of which we are partakers. . . . The philosophic historian, whose gorge rose at the doctrine of the Fall, thought much worse of man practically than the Fathers of the Church' (p. 144).

This is how Mohammedanism is touched off :

'Let us be just to it. It once elevated the pagan Arabs. Even now it elevates the negro above his fetisch. But it must ever remain a religion for stationary races, with its sterile God and its poor literality, the dead book pressing upon it with a weight of lead. Its merits are these : it inculcates a lofty if sterile Theism ; it fulfils the pledge conveyed by the word Moslem, by inspiring a calm if frigid resignation to destiny ; it teaches the duty of prayer with a strange impressiveness. But whole realms of thought and feeling are crushed out by its bloody and lustful grasp. It is without purity, without tenderness, and without humility' (p. 111).

Buddhism in like manner is thus sentenced :

'It is the opium drunkenness of the spiritual world without the dreams that are its temporary consolation. It is enervating without being soft, and contemplative without being profound. It is a religion which is spiritual without recognizing the soul, virtuous without the conception of duty, moral without the admission of liberty, charitable without love. It surveys a world without nature, and a universe without God' (p. 157).

The change which has come over modern unbelief is thus described :

'The unbelief of the last century advanced with flashing epigrams and defiant songs. With Byron it softened at times into a melancholy which was perhaps partly affected. But with Amiel, and others of our own day, unbelief assumes a sweet and dirge-like tone. The satanic mirth of the past unbelief is exchanged for a satanic melancholy in the present' (p. 158).

The author's practical wisdom in spiritual things may be seen in the whole Discourse on 'Lofty Ideals perilous unless applied,' and in such sayings as these : 'There is always a danger in setting out with a stricter standard than Christ's, a narrower road than the narrow one which leads to heaven. Experience proves that

they who begin with standards of duty which are impossibly high, end with standards of duty which are sometimes sadly low. Such men have tried the impracticable and failed ; the practicable seems to be too hard for them ever afterwards' (p. 145). 'This reliance upon feelings'—he is speaking of 'emotionalism'—'is in the last analysis the reliance upon self. It is a form of salvation by works ; for feelings are inward actions. It is an unhappy anachronism which inverts the order of Scripture ; which substitutes peace and grace (the compendious dogma of the heresy of the emotions) for grace and peace, the only order known to St. Paul and St. John' (p. 194). How much thought and insight finds expression in these remarks on the Judgment : 'Society without the General Judgment would be a chaos of random facts, a thing without rational retrospect or definite end—*i.e.* without God.' Again, 'Conscience, as a matter of fact, has two voices. One is *imperative* ; it tells us what we are to do. One is *prophetic*, and warns us of something which we are to receive. If there is to be no Day of the General Judgment, then the million prophecies of conscience will be belied, and our nature prove to be mendacious to its very roots' (p. 215).

But, indeed, there are dozens of other passages as worthy to be quoted as these. And the book is illustrated by a wealth of touching anecdotes and beautiful similes.

To our minds, then, it is a pity that the Bishop of Derry has not stuck a little more closely to his text. We should have liked to have had more of his help towards a spiritual understanding—to take examples from the first chapter alone—of the 'darkness' and 'light' which St. John contrasts—of the 'fellowship one with another' which is the result of 'walking in the light' and a condition of being 'cleansed'—of the 'cleansing' itself and of the way in which we may look to have the precious 'Blood' applied to us—of the way in which forgiveness and cleansing result from God's being 'faithful and just.' There yet remains an abundance of material for the Bishop to work up for us in these Epistles. Among minor criticisms, we hope that the venerable author's 'reader' will pay more attention in the next issue to correcting the proofs where Latin and Greek are quoted. Perhaps the Bishop will forgive us also if we remind him that 'Gaius' (p. 300) is as much the Latin as the Greek form of the name, and that the use of the initial 'C.' to denote that name dates from the time when Latin had no 'G.' And we cannot help wishing that he had adopted what seems to us the much more probable view, that the 'Kyria,' of whose children St. John had found some walking in truth, was a Church (like the 'elect one in Babylon'), and not an individual.

*Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals: a Course of Lectures delivered in Ripon Cathedral on the Nicene Creed.* By MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A. (Rivingtons, 1889.)

THE publication of this book illustrates remarkably and hopefully the amount of interest which can still be excited by a judicious and sympathetic presentation of theological teaching to a large and

somewhat miscellaneous auditory. Canon MacColl was asked by some members of the ordinary cathedral congregation at Ripon 'to give them a regular course of instruction on some points of Christian doctrine.' What follows is best told in his own words:—

'I gladly agreed, and chose the Nicene Creed as a subject of exposition. Expecting only some forty or fifty persons to be present, I intended to give the instructions at my private residence. The numbers, however, who intimated their intention to attend were so large that I was obliged to meet them in the nave of the Cathedral. What were meant to be mere informal and catechetical Instructions thus grew into a set of formal Lectures. They were delivered extempore, and were reported in several newspapers. . . . Letters have reached me from all parts of the kingdom, and also from the Continent, urging me to publish the Lectures in a volume. Some of these were *from working men*. . . . I am so conscious of the many defects of style and reasoning which disfigure the Lectures that I should not offer them to the public at all were it not for the many intimations that have reached me, especially *from working men all over the country*, that the Lectures would be useful to persons who have not leisure to study for themselves the questions with which I have dealt.'

We are very glad that Canon MacColl received these requests, and that he has complied with them. The book, we are persuaded, will be 'profitable' for confirmation in belief, and for the abatement of popular anti-dogmatic prejudices. The author speaks throughout as one habitually conscious of the intellectual conditions of his own period. He never puts off his hearers or readers with mere conventionalisms of statement; he shows a perpetual determination to keep 'in touch' with what men are really thinking, to confront 'difficulties' which they actually feel. Of this *reality* as a characteristic of his argument, which is also illustrated by frequent references to the wonders of modern science, we might give several instances; but, for lack of space, we will only quote his opening words:—

'Before we enter into any detailed examination of the Nicene Creed, it may be well to consider an objection that meets us on the threshold. "Why," we sometimes hear it asked, "should we have creeds at all? Are they necessary? Are they not, on the contrary, mischievous, putting fetters on the mind, and abridging the area of its free exercise? Are they not, in fact, a fence set up by artful theologians to bar access to the salubrious common of freethought, in order to keep mankind in the bondage of priesthood?"' (p. 1).

He proceeds to use the simile of a 'free common,' by contending that it was heresy, not orthodoxy, which circumscribed the common area of Christian belief by its negations; as Arianism in effect, by treating Christ as adorable though not essentially divine,

'proposed to take away a large portion of the common heritage of Christendom, and to build upon it a temple to idolatry. How did the Church meet the Arian heresy? By expelling the trespasser . . . and to prevent any further attempt at spoliation, the Church put a fence round the common, with a conspicuous notice to warn off intruders. In other words, it drew up the Nicene Creed, and inserted into it a definition—"of the same substance with the Father"—which effectually excluded

Arianism  
—a ran-  
commu-

He  
he after  
point o  
original  
cardinal  
Incarn  
men, w  
munic  
new po  
perm o  
hood,  
Nothin  
added  
because  
obviou  
as it e  
ceeds  
Christ  
momen  
forms a  
nature  
sonalit  
of a "f  
ness, w  
interest  
which  
have li  
For ins  
ousness  
disclaim  
represe  
had ov  
condemn  
merely  
way; a  
in his r  
render  
when th  
We can  
express  
is calle  
pitiation  
evil-do  
Divine  
admits  
demur  
speak,

Arianism. The Creed was thus in its origin and purpose purely defensive—a rampart to guard the body of revealed truth for the use of the Christian community throughout the world' (p. 4).

Here, obviously, Canon MacColl assumes for the moment what he afterwards supports in detail, that the 'common,' from a Christian point of view, is not of indefinite 'free thought,' but of belief in the original Christian revelation. If we look next at his treatment of one cardinal point of faith, the 'personal union' of two natures in the Incarnate, we find a clear distinction drawn between the 'nature' in men, which is transmitted, and the 'personality,' which is incomunicable—the former being 'organized in every individual in a new personality not derived from Adam,' whereas in Christ 'the germ of humanity,' supernaturally vitalized without human fatherhood, 'was taken up into the personality of the Eternal Word.' Nothing could be better as a statement of the truth; but when it is added that sin was excepted from our Lord's assumption of humanity because it was no part of the nature 'in which man was created,' it is obvious to remark that our Lord did not assume humanity simply as it existed in the un fallen Adam, for, as Canon MacColl proceeds to explain, and illustrates the point with luminous emphasis, Christ was 'not only impeccant, but impeccableness.' With regard to this momentous point, it is true that 'He fought temptation in all its forms as man,' but does this imply that 'He withdrew His human nature from the shield of the Divine personality'? It was that personality which necessarily shielded His manhood from the possibility of a 'fall'; it was the Incarnation which secured the absolute sinlessness, while it left a real scope for 'temptation.' There is much of interest in what our author says as to the supernatural conception which cut off in Christ the 'moral entail' of evil. But we should have liked to see on some points a more cautious choice of language. For instance, in one passage (p. 100) he appears to deny the 'vicariousness' of our Lord's death. It is hardly necessary at this time to disclaim the crude, repulsive, and gravely unsound notion which would represent the Father as 'vengeful' and unloving, as if the Passion had overcome His reluctance to forgive. Modern writers always do condemn it, but who now seriously holds it? or who thinks of a merely arbitrary substitution? The pendulum has swung the other way; as the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol most opportunely said in his recent Charge, opinions current among us, and spreading, 'surrender truths which belong to the very essence of the doctrine, as when the Atonement is reduced to an intense expression of sympathy.' We cannot help wishing that Canon MacColl might reconsider some expressions of his own when a new edition of these popular lectures is called for. He explains the Scriptural terms 'ransom' and 'propitiation' as pointing to 'a law of compensation or retribution' for evil-doing imposed by 'the Divine justice, which is the offspring of Divine love at war with sin' (p. 170). In this sense he virtually admits the idea of satisfaction, and therein of vicariousness; but we demur to the description of Divine justice as merely a function, so to speak, of Divine mercy. We must surely hold both the ideas together

as co-ordinate, although they give us but 'fragments and vistas' of the whole truth. Sin, as a breach of what Dr. Dale calls 'the eternal law of righteousness,' did constitute an objective barrier to the full outflow of Divine benignity; and as the worldwide prevalence of sacrifice testified to a worldwide conviction that, 'to meet their Maker, men a victim need,' so the detachment of that conviction from notions unworthy of the Divine perfection leaves intact the belief that the reconciliation is twofold in character, as was maintained by Pearson in his day, and by Archbishop Trench and Bishop Ellicott in our own. After all due disclaimers, and all legitimate explanations, in order to the abatement of 'moral difficulties,' there is a mystery in the Atonement of Christ; and the simplifications which smooth away its sterner edges will be found to tell against the whole idea of Mediation, as also against a full belief in the Divine personality of the Atoner.

But to return to Canon MacColl. We may refer to a suggestive passage as to the untenability of an arbitrary line between all Scriptural and all 'ecclesiastical miracles' (p. 193). Dr. Mozley, in his *Bampton Lectures*, attempted to draw such a line; but we agree with our author that the 'tests' there suggested prove far 'too much for believers in the inspiration of the Bible; it is proverbially dangerous to play with edged tools.' We agree with him also, of course, in denying that miracles involve a violation or suspension of the laws of nature. As Dr. Jellett has said, in his excellent lectures on Prayer, they involve only the introduction of a new force. But Canon MacColl should be on his guard against questionable analogies; and we regret the hint that the New Testament miracles may be exhibitions on a large scale of the power exerted 'by a strong will, imbued with faith, acting on a weaker will,' and through it on the body (p. 198). A Rationalistic reader, we fear, would 'make capital' out of this mode of dealing with the 'difficulties' of physiologists.

We recommend for special attention, as richly and helpfully suggestive, the remarks on the Ascension and the Scriptural meaning of heaven (p. 221), and on the Eucharist as disseminative of the 'essential humanity' of the life-giving Redeemer 'as the source and sustaining nutriment of our spiritual life,'—a supernatural counterpart to the physical 'dissemination of the essential humanity of Adam among the millions of his descendants.' These topics are handled in the tenth lecture. The omission of any formal treatment of the article on the Holy Spirit is not explained in the preface, and we hope that it may ere long be remedied.

The lecture on the Church includes a discussion of sacerdotalism, in which the character of the priest as representative of the Christian laity is emphasized, while at the same time the notion of a mere delegation by the laity is excluded. The Roman claim of 'absolute perfection' for the true Church is acutely analyzed; and in the same lecture it is most truly affirmed, with regard to Universalism, that 'an incorrigible paralysis of the will and perversion of the affections, such as cannot be called impossible, constitutes "everlasting perdition for a moral being" (p. 310).

Our space is exhausted; but it is long since we have 'noticed' a

work from which we should so gladly have quoted more. We may point out an erratum at the foot of p. 191, where, for 'asserts,' the sense requires us to read 'denies.'

*The Latin Heptateuch: Critically Reviewed.* By JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M.A. (Cambridge University Press.)

THE ancient hexameter versification of the first seven books of the Old Testament, to which the Cambridge Professor of Latin has just devoted a volume of notes, has had a rather curious history. As early as 1560 A.D. 'Cypriani Genesis' figured in a collection of Christian poems published at Paris by Morel, and four years later it passed into that printer's edition of St. Cyprian, and has reappeared in the Vienna edition (Hartel, 1871) of the same Father. It is a metrical paraphrase of Genesis i. 1 to iv. 12, where it abruptly breaks off; and had Hartel known under what author's name to look, he might have added to Morel's 165 lines about 4,500 more, published in the interval. Already in the seventeenth century Sirmond saw, but did not publish, three MSS. containing the six books from Exodus to Judges under the name of Alcimus Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, A.D. 490-523. The Benedictine Martene, in volume ix. of his *Veterum Scriptorum . . . Collectio* (1733), was the first to print new matter, and nearly completed Genesis, but in turn (on the authority of his MS.) as the work of 'Juvencus Presbyter Hispanus' of the fourth century; and this ascription was repeated by Cardinal Pitra, to whom belongs the credit of multiplying the printed text fourfold, partly in the *Spicilegium Solesmense* (vol. i. pp. 171-258; A.D. 1852), and finally in the *Analecta Sacra* (vol. v. pp. 181-207; A.D. 1888). The poem appears now to be a complete Heptateuch, with the exception of the last three chapters of Judges; but the entry in the tenth-century Catalogue of the monastery of Lauresham or Lorsch (Becker, *Catalogi*, 37, 463)—'metrum Cypriani super heptateuchum et regum et Hester Judith et Machabaeorum'—seems to show that it was originally continued throughout the historical books.

Both Sirmond and also Arevalo (who reprinted the Genesis in 1782) laid stress on the employment of unusual metrical licences to refute the claims of Avitus and Juvencus respectively; and Professor Mayor now calls attention to a clear quotation of Claudian in Exodus, ll. 529-531. Since the evidence of the oldest MSS. and of the Lauresham Catalogue suggests a Cyprian, we shall probably be right in following Peiper, the scholar entrusted with the edition of the poem for the Vienna Corpus, and selecting as the author Cyprian, third Bishop of Toulon (ob. c. 550 A.D.), and pupil of St. Caesarius of Arles.

The MSS. employed by Pitra were two from Laon, and one, apparently the best, from Trinity College, Cambridge; but as all three present a series of lines from Judges mutilated at the commencement, all must derive from one similarly imperfect archetype. So far, therefore, as that was itself corrupt, a promising field was open throughout for critical ingenuity; and Professor Mayor, while cordially recognising the supreme services of the *editio princeps* by dedi-

cating his book to Pitra, and after Pitra's death to his colleagues of Solesmes, now places before the public, and especially before future editors of the poem, his own emendations and lexicographical notes, with a more correct collation of the Cambridge MS. C (and also, we are obliged to add, with a great deal of extraneous matter, such as reminiscences of Kennedy and polemics against Huxley), but without any reprint of the text ; so that to find this we must still have recourse to three or four different quarters. But students of Juvenal know very well that we must take Professor Mayor as we find him.

' My conjectures were almost all made in the space of six weeks, and as I approached the goal, I learnt to tolerate many licences which at the outset seemed indefensible. Now the glow of composition has cooled down, and I no longer feel a parental fondness for my offspring ' (Preface, p. lxv).

We find, then, Professor Mayor in agreement with us, that many conjectures, at least in the earlier pages, are quite superfluous. The MSS. readings *fiat*, *lātūrus*, *cārēo*, *quāternae*, and (at the beginning of the line) *lāboris*, are all corrected throughout, only to be rightly reinstated at the end ; see on Levit. 93, Numb. 205, and Addenda on Gen. 6, Exod. 379, Numb. 352. In fact, the MSS. are not worthless enough to be set aside, at least when their witness rests on more than a single passage ; even the lengthening of a short syllable at the beginning of the verse rests on forty-three instances (p. li), and claims serious consideration. On the same lines we should plead for the retention of *bitumen* (twice), *Judæa* (in the fifth foot, thrice), *prēter* (four times), *nivōsus* (thrice), *ōmittō* (twice). And excellent scholar as Professor Mayor is, his rewritten verses do not seem to us to catch the rough-and-ready, but very forcible, vigour of the original ; though many of his corrections of less extent are beautiful and certain, witness Judges 169, *sub veste recinctus* (Pitra, *subverteret ictus*, C, *subvertere cinctus*), 187 *Aotus*, i.e. *Ehud* (Pitra, *acutos*, MSS. *audos*) ; cf. Exod. 1323, *Auses*, i.e. *Joshua*.

But it is as a storehouse of lexicography that this volume is most thoroughly valuable. Lists of the chief words thus commented on are given, alphabetically on p. xliv, and in order of occurrence on p. lxxii, and the note on any one of them is proof in itself of the extraordinary and varied erudition of the editor. It is, indeed, a little startling to find that these indices include a word conjecturally introduced like *ventrosos* (Numb. 491, MSS. *inemptos*), even when in the Addenda it is practically withdrawn. And even on lexicographical grounds we must join issue with Professor Mayor's note 'read *Detractet*' for 'si festa *retractet*' (Numbers, *Analecta*, 175, ch. ix. 13) of refusal to keep the Passover. *Retracto* can be quoted in both senses of *detracto* : 'to refuse,' e.g. Tertullian, *De Jejuniis*, 15, 'retractatores hujus officii,' a close parallel ; 'to disparage,' e.g. the African Old Latin of 1 Peter ii. 12, as quoted by St. Cyprian (Test. iii. 11, Ep. 13, 3), 'dum retractant de vobis quasi malignis,' representing a Greek καταλαλόνσιν ; the scribes in both these cases tending to agree with Professor Mayor in substituting the false *detracto*.

Professor Mayor thus concludes his Preface : 'I shall be abund-

antly reading the V  
agreed  
'Cyp  
Latin  
questio  
s'il s'e  
If a re  
may a  
nuntia  
have se  
tions o  
'Cyp  
Greek  
antece  
we lea  
partly  
would  
most f  
poem  
the Old  
thanks  
stimula  
We  
rection  
(1)

C, follo  
which

haec

vultu

(2)

Is not  
fifty-five  
(unless  
to repla  
and gov  
there a  
like no

(3)

' Read  
VOL.

antly rewarded . . . if, lastly, any new light is here thrown on a single reading of the Old Latin version, or on its survival side by side with the Vulgate ;' and on p. xlili he had instanced a few specimens of agreement with the LXX or Old Latin against the Vulgate. That 'Cyprian' did not use the Vulgate is clear ; whether he used any Latin version at all is a question worth asking. Pitra rightly puts the question, 'quelle version latine Juvencus avait devant ses yeux, et s'il s'en est tenu au Septante, quelle révision il a suivie de préférence.' If a rendering like *pelagus* (Numb. 210, LXX θύλασσα, Vulg. *occidens*) may as well come from a version as from an individual, one like *nuntius dei* (Judges 269, LXX ἀγγελος θεοῦ), where *angelus* would have scanned as well, suggests individual caprice. And the transliterations of Greek names compared (p. xlili) present variations ; thus, 'Cyprian' has *Cadera*, O.L. *Ader* ; 'Cyprian' *Sichima*, O.L. *Sicima*. Greek survived more vigorously in South Gaul than one would antecedently have supposed. From 'Cyprian's' own life of Caesarius we learn that the Psalms were then sung at Arles partly in Greek, partly in Latin (Zahn, *Neuest. Kanon*, i. p. 47). But on the whole it would seem more probable that some Latin version must have been most familiar to our author, and, if so, careful examination of the poem ought substantially to reinforce our too scanty knowledge of the Old Latin O. T. Professor Mayor therefore merits the warmest thanks of Biblical scholars in England for directing attention to, and stimulating interest in, so curious a relic of Christian antiquity.

We venture, in conclusion, to supplement Professor Mayor's corrections by one or two of our own.

(1) Genesis, l. 27 (ch. i. 26)—

Haec memorat 'hominem nostris faciamus in unguem  
vultibus adsimilem' :

C, followed by Mayor, *in oris* for *in unguem* ; but a reading is needed which will explain both variants. Read therefore—

haec memorat ; 'hominem faciamus imagine nostri (*or* nostris)  
vultibus (*or* vultus) adsimilem.'

(2) Numb. ll. 199, 200 (ch. ii. ; cf. ch. xxvi.)—

quinquies et denos domuum quum deinde viritim  
notio perdocuit, procerum bis millia sena.

Is not the reference to the 'families' of the tribes enumerated as fifty-five in ch. xxvi., and to the twelve princes ? If so, we want first (unless the reckoning is a round one) an additional *quinq*ue, perhaps to replace *deinde* ; and in any case a noun in agreement with *denos* and governing *domuum*, perhaps *patres* out of *perdocuit*. Lastly, as there are 12, not 12,000, *procerum*, *millia* must yield to something like *nomina*.

(3) Numb. l. 206 (ch. iii. 14)—

tertia bis ternis similibus atque ducentis  
exhibituit.

<sup>4</sup> Read *SED milibus*, Mayor ; surely *se milibus*.

(4) Numb. *Analecta*, ll. 129–133, 146–148 (ch. vii. 10–12, 85, 86)—

129 Interea tribuum proceres, pia dona ferentes,  
discretos habuere dies; namque agmina plebis  
sunt quinquaginta simul viginti et millia bina  
bis denis ducenta viris; quorum ordini primo  
vovit Juda tribus donum, Nassone tribuno.

146 Omnibus in vasis pariter si summa locetur,  
at vero in gabatis caelato ardentibus auro  
viginti centumque fiunt per pondera librae.

In line 132 C has rightly *senis* for *denis*, and *ordine*; l. 131, Mayor rightly *quingenta*, but without seeing that this line should be transposed after l. 146. Just as the separate gifts of Nasson, respectively of 130 silver, 70 silver, and 10 gold shekels (ch. vii. 13), are combined in l. 135 as of 210 pondera, so here the gifts of the twelve princes, amounting to 2400 silver and 120 gold shekels (ch. vii. 85, 86), are added together. 'If the sum of all the vessels be put together, they are 2520' pondera, this, and not Mayor's 522,000, being the true total of the figures. Then, in line 132, we emend *ducenda* for *ducenta*—twelve tribes led by twelve princes—though the defective grammar suggests that the misplaced line 131 has ousted a genuine predecessor.

(5) Numb. *Analecta* 154 (ch. viii. 2)—‘bis senas vomuere faces.’  
Read, apparently, *septenas*.

*Origines du Culte Chrétien: étude sur la Liturgie Latine avant Charlemagne.* Par l'ABBÉ L. DUCHESNE. (Paris: E. Thorin, 1889.)

No apology is necessary for introducing to English readers anything so valuable as these lectures by the Abbé Duchesne, already known as the editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* and a distinguished representative of the great Parisian school of historical criticism; and one characteristic of his work will be specially gratifying to them. While the normal belief beyond the Rhine is that literature and learning scarcely exist outside the fatherland, M. Duchesne is well acquainted with such liturgical studies as our country has produced, and we mark references to Bingham, to Neale and Forbes, to Hammond, to Warren, and to Swainson.

M. Duchesne opens with a slight sketch of the origins of Christian organization. He can admit frankly the civil origin of ecclesiastical boundaries or ecclesiastical vestments, and it is therefore no mere partisan who bluntly declines to discuss the theory which makes the pagan guilds the model for the Christian Churches. It was the Jewry of a Greek town which suggested the organization, as its worship—the worship of the synagogue, not of the Temple—formed the starting-point for the liturgy, of the Christian community (pp. 1–11, 45–49).

The remainder of the first chapter is devoted to ‘les circonscriptions ecclésiastiques,’ distinguishing the grouping of the various

Chu  
by li  
quite  
the  
ches  
in th  
tury.  
bishi  
Mil  
coun  
bian  
had i  
to th  
rank  
capita  
affect  
and  
enoug  
Churc  
be co

F  
an ex  
Weste  
Rom  
of the  
first s  
Churc  
of syn  
a seal  
porary  
Spanis  
rather  
Englis  
Rhône  
appar  
to hav  
have b  
earlier  
ficien  
Rome,  
(preni  
identi  
manize

1 W  
inera  
désir  
tions an  
L'apôtre  
se trouv  
royaume

Churches by organization as a necessary preliminary to their grouping by liturgical usage. With one exception there is little here that is quite novel ; but the exception is important, because it bears on the central theory which is developed later in the book. M. Duchesne calls attention to the predominance of the see of Milan in the later years of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century. The influence of St. Ambrose is felt even in the East ; the bishops of Africa and of Spain consult simultaneously Rome and Milan. At Aquileia and Turin the Milanese bishop presided over councils whose decrees were accepted without question in the Danubian and Gallic provinces, and whatever authority the Pope had had in these districts was vanishing. If something of this was due to the personal characteristics of St. Ambrose, more was due to the rank of his city, acquired under Diocletian, as the administrative capital and imperial residence of the West. This hegemony was affected in the fifth century by the rise of the Exarchate of Ravenna and the severance of the barbarian kingdoms, and did not last long enough to have affected permanently the organization of the Western Church ; but, short as it was, it was of supreme moment, if Duchesne be correct, in the sphere of liturgical development.

For while it has long been admitted, it has scarcely been an explained fact, that the further we trace back the history of Western service books, the more clearly do two divergent uses, the Roman and the Gallican, distinguish themselves, while the latter of them approaches proportionately nearer to an Oriental type. The first stage of development, when the liturgies of the various great Churches were being formed independently out of the common stock of synagogue ritual and apostolic tradition, is, and must always remain, a sealed book. But a comparison of extant materials and contemporary notices enables us to see that in the fourth century the Gallic, Spanish, and British Churches used a form of worship Eastern rather than Roman. This phenomenon has been explained by English writers from the early connexion of the Churches of the Rhone valley with those of Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup> M. Duchesne considers apparently that the common material is too advanced and too complex to have developed as early as the second century ; the West must have borrowed a full-grown liturgy from the East, and therefore not earlier than the fourth century. But on what lines was there sufficient intercourse at that time between East and West, apart from Rome, to explain the transplantation ? Our author would answer (premising that in his belief the Ambrosian ritual was in its origin identical with the Gallican, though already in course of being Romanized when we first learn any details about it), through Milan,

<sup>1</sup> We cannot resist quoting the following note (p. 85). 'Je n'examinerai pas ici quelle influence peut avoir eue, sur les jugements anglais, le desir de rattacher les origines liturgiques de ce pays [Gaul] à des traditions anciennes et respectables, différentes toutefois de celle de Rome. L'apôtre saint Jean, par l'intermédiaire de saint Polycarpe et saint Pothin, se trouve être, dans ce système, comme l'ancêtre de la Haute-Eglise du royaume-un. Etre apostolique sans être romain ; c'est bien séduisant.'

the only meeting-point besides Rome for Eastern and Western concourse ; and probably under Auxentius, the Arian from Cappadocia, who preceded St. Ambrose as bishop from 355 to 374 A.D.

From the eighth century onwards the passion for uniformity tended to suppress divergent usages. At the same time, since this result was attained rather through fusion than through the entire obliteration of the Gallican element, evidence of the ninth and later centuries cannot, as a rule, come under discussion. What is given (ch. v.) is an account, more clear and concise than any of which we are aware elsewhere, of the documents from which the pre-Karolingian uses of the West are to be restored. For the Roman use, there is first the 'Gregorian' Sacramentary, sent by Pope Hadrian into Gaul (c. 780 A.D.), containing the local Roman or Pope's use for ordinations and festival Eucharists ; then the 'Gelasian' introduced into Gaul a century earlier, but without the same topographical allusions to Rome, and in its present form adulterated with much Gallican mixture ; thirdly, the Leonine, purely Roman in character, consisting of the Eucharistic services from April till the end of the year, dated by its connexion with some great siege of Rome, and conjecturally fixed by Duchesne to A.D. 538 ; and besides these some of the *Ordines Romani* of Mabillon (Nos. i. vii. viii. ix.) and a group from a St. Amand MS. discovered at Paris by our author, and printed as an appendix to the present volume. The Gallican documents are more fragmentary, and these which are purely Gallican are the most fragmentary of all—a bit of a Sacramentary from a Reichenau palimpsest (published by Mone), a lectionary of Luxeuil, and two letters of St. Germanus of Paris, describing and interpreting the worship of his Church. A detailed account, put together from these documents, of the Eucharistic usages of the two rites is given in the sixth and seventh chapters.

Nowhere is the wide reading and lucid treatment of the author conspicuous to more advantage than in the following (eighth) chapter on Christian festivals. The week, with the special services of Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday—the moveable feasts and fasts, Easter, Pentecost, Lent, Holy Week—the fixed feasts, Christmas and the succeeding days, Epiphany, the feasts of the Virgin, of St. John Baptist, of the Apostles, and of Martyrs—all in turn are passed under review, and every kind of evidence from all quarters of the Church adduced briefly in illustration.

We have not space to follow in detail the later chapters which discuss in succession the services of baptism and confirmation, of ordination, of the consecration of churches and of virgins, of marriage, and generally of all those rites and sacraments which have 'in a marked degree the character of collective acts, ecclesiastical in the true meaning of the word' (preface, p. v.) ; but we should like to draw attention to the notes on pp. 328, 363, where it is shown that the absence of express mention (especially in Eastern rituals) of the imposition of hands in confirmation and ordination does not point to the omission of the rite. On p. 332, with reference to the minor orders, the mention in the letter of Pope Cornelius (Eus.

H. acol of t form that as n and as H intro dead for th diacon

already from pilgr the fo editor by G much time Jerus this l equal of 'v O

The SS. A glad the S of om tion. from

The C

THE i an ide the tit but whi gather on ear of the if the they c been sou racy a

*H. E.* vi. 43) of seven deacons, seven subdeacons, and forty-two acolytes at Rome is interpreted—in conformity with the statements of the Liberian catalogue, that Fabian, Cornelius' predecessor, formed the seven church 'regiones,' and of John the Deacon that 'septem regionibus ecclesiastica apud nos militia continetur'—as meaning that each of seven regions had a deacon, a subdeacon, and six acolytes assigned to it. This is perhaps at least as probable as Harnack's ingenious idea that the fourteen secular 'regiones' introduced by Augustus were appropriated by Fabian to seven deacons and seven subdeacons, the latter order being instituted for this very purpose to bring up the numbers to fourteen, since the diaconate proper was conceived of as necessarily limited to seven.

The appendices contain, besides the *Ordines* from St. Amand already mentioned, and two ritual fragments from Gaul, a long extract from the newly discovered *Peregrinatio Silvæ*. This story of a pilgrimage to the Holy Places of the East undertaken at the end of the fourth century by a lady of rank from south Gaul—identified by the editor with Silvia, the sister of Stilicho's rival, Rufinus—was published by Gamurrini in 1887; and M. Duchesne reprints (pp. 469–500) so much of it as consists of a description, with full notes of place and time of day, of the Church services, both regular and occasional, of Jerusalem and the neighbourhood. The direct historical interest of this little traveller's journal is very great, and apparently it would be equally interesting, from a subordinate point of view, as a specimen of 'vulgar' Latin.

On one point of liturgical interest we are enabled to add a remark. The ancient native rite of the Nestorian Church, the Liturgy of SS. Addæus and Maris (now about to be printed in Syriac, we are glad to hear, under the auspices of the Archbishop's Mission and of the S.P.C.K.), presents, as M. Duchesne says, the unique peculiarity of omitting the recital during consecration of the Words of Institution. We learn on first-hand authority that the words, though absent from the documents, are an invariable feature in the service as said.

*The Classical Element in the New Testament Considered as a Proof of its Genuineness.* By CHARLES H. HOOLE, M.A., student of Christ Church, Oxford. (London: Macmillan, 1888.)

THE idea of this book is a capital one, though we are afraid it is only an idea still; nor is it exactly the idea conveyed by the first words of the title. This is no discussion of classical and Hellenistic Greek; but the history of the proper names and titles (not being Jewish) which occur in the New Testament is traced out as far as it can be gathered, especially from heathen evidence, appendices being added on early references to Christianity, and on early quotations and lists of the canonical books. It would have been a gain in homogeneity if the references to Christian writers had been entirely withdrawn—they can all be found as well or better elsewhere—and the remainder been rechristened 'the New Testament illustrated from classical sources.' It is a more serious matter that the high standard of accuracy and completeness indispensable to any such scheme as that of

Mr. Hoole's has not been attained. Thus we find names entirely omitted—*e.g.* under A, Agabus and *Aeneas* of the Acts, Antipas of the Apocalypse, or under I, Jason of Thessalonica and (Titius) Justus of Corinth, as well as technical terms like the *strategi* of Philippi or the *politarchai* of Thessalonica. And in the articles themselves, while there is much useful information given, there are also serious gaps. For Pudens and Claudia no reference is given to Martial. Under the later history of the name Herod, the Herod of St. Polycarp's martyrdom is unnoticed. Gallio's 'name occurs as that of a friend of Seneca.' The comments on the *personnel* of St. Paul's Epistles show no knowledge of Bishop Lightfoot's commentaries, though a reference to *Colossians* would have corrected the note on Appia, or to *Philippians* the notes on Roman Christians like Amplias and Apelles, besides suggesting an alternative view for the 'households' of Narcissus and Aristobulus. When we add that Mr. Hoole is unaware that *Γαλατία* can mean Gaul (p. 31); that he decides that 'it is on the whole the best course to suppose the existence of three Clements'—'the author of the *two* Epistles to the Corinthians,' Flavius Clemens the Consul, 'a third Clement, the author of the Apostolic Constitutions and other doubtful writings, who is a fictitious person'; that he describes the MS. D of St. Paul's Epistles as 'perhaps as early as A.D. 250'; it is obvious that he is not a trustworthy guide, at least in ecclesiastical history. There is so much value in the aim, and so much good intention in the execution, of this book, that it is with regret that we conclude that it will need a new edition and a drastic revision before it can even be considered to be in a fair way to achieve its object.

*Wissenschaftliche Abhandlung über Lactantius de mortibus persecutorum*, cap. 34. By Professor Dr. BELSER. (Ellwangen : 1889.)

THIS paper—an academic *Festprogramm*—is an able and pains-taking monograph upon the famous Edict of Toleration published by Galerius in 311. It defends, in a convincing manner, the historical accuracy of Lactantius against the scepticism of Hunziker, showing that the Edict was, as a matter of fact, issued by the dying emperor in remorse, for the purpose, if possible, of averting the wrath of the God of the persecuted Christians. There is much new and interesting matter brought to bear upon its elucidation; in particular it is shown that there is good ground for supposing that the unhappy Christian wife of Galerius, Diocletian's daughter, may have influenced her husband to issue it. As against Mr. Mason, whose early work on the Persecution Dr. Belser in the main follows, he shows, with good reason, we think, that there is no intentional ambiguity in the Edict. The words *cum videremus nec diis eisdem cultum exhibere nec Christianorum decum observare* (which originally suggested Mr. Mason's interpretation) mean, on Dr. Belser's showing, that when the Persecution *had begun*, instead of having the desired effect of bringing the Christians to worship the State gods, it only cut them off from the observance of their own rites, and so left them without any public religion at all. This seems very pro-

entirely  
pas of  
(Titius)  
tegi of  
articles  
ere are  
ven to  
rod of  
curs as  
of St.  
mmen-  
ed the  
christians  
e view  
we add  
p. 31);  
suppose  
Epistles  
lement,  
oubtful  
the MS.  
; it is  
siastical  
ood in-  
that we  
n before  
ject.

persecu-  
1889.)

and pains-  
published  
historical  
showing  
ing em-  
the wrath  
new and  
in partic-  
that the  
may have  
n, whose  
llows, he  
onal am-  
*s eosdem*  
originally  
r's show-  
aving the  
ate gods,  
s, and so  
very pro-

bable. Galerius is not, then, taunting the Christians with having deserted their primitive faith—nor, indeed, is he concerned to deny, any more than to affirm, that they maintained their religion in secret. The point is that the persecuting Edict had put an end to all visible religious devotions on the part of the Christians. But the wonder still remains that the fanatical heathen emperor should have felt that it was worse for Christians to have no religion at all than to worship their own exclusive Deity, and should have proceeded to ask their prayers. Galerius is thus shown in a more honourable, if a still less explicable, character, and it may be hoped that the prayers which he requested were heard for his soul. We shall look with interest for the larger work on Lactantius which this monograph promises.

Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Ζιγαβρηνοῦ Ἐρμηνεία εἰς τὰς ἴδιας Ἐπιστολὰς τοῦ Ἀποστόλου  
Παιώνιον καὶ εἰς τὰς ζ' Καθολικὰς νῦν πρώτον ἐκ παλαιῶν χειρογράφων  
ἐκδιδούμενη μετὰ προλόγου καὶ σημειώσεων ὑπὸ Νικηφόρου Καλογέρα  
Ἀρχιεπιστόκου πρώτην Πατρών, &c. . . . Καθηγητοῦ τῆς Θεολογίας  
ἐν τῷ Ἀθηναϊκῷ Πανεπιστημίῳ. 2 vols. (Athens, 1887.)

THIS Commentary by Euthymius Zigabenus on the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul and on the seven Catholic Epistles is preceded by an interesting introduction of about a hundred pages from the pen of the learned editor, Nicephorus Calogeras, sometime Archbishop of Patras, in which he gives us an account of the life and times of the author, together with the circumstances which led to the discovery of the important manuscript on which the work is based. In the year 1792 Matthaei published at Leipzig Euthymius's valuable Commentary on the Gospels. The Archbishop informs us how he, while quite a young man, derived such advantage from this work that he longed to see a complete exegesis of the New Testament by Euthymius. Remembering how a large body of learned Greeks had fled, with their manuscripts, from their homes to Italy, when Constantinople was taken by the Turks, he resolved to follow in their footsteps, with the intention of exploring the most important libraries in Rome. Unfortunately, on his arrival in July 1879, he found the Vatican closed, while his leave of absence did not permit him to await its reopening. Somewhat disconsolately he betook himself to the celebrated library belonging to Santa Maria sopra Minerva, which, from the number and value of its manuscripts, is second only to that of the Vatican. There he discovered, in the list of commentaries on the New Testament, a so-called anonymous manuscript. But to his intense delight this was the very manuscript which constituted the object of his search ; signed, moreover, with the author's name. Working in the reading-room five hours a day for two months, he only succeeded in copying the portion of the commentary which dealt with the Epistle to the Romans and half that on 1 Corinthians, when he was obliged to resume his duties in the Athenian University. By the courtesy, however, of Signor Castellani, of the Central Library of Victor Emmanuel, he had this manuscript photographed. It is in folio, consisting of 466 leaves, of which four or five at the beginning have been lost. The writing is on

paper tolerably thick, bright, and admirably preserved. The text of the Epistles is written at the top in red letters, the commentary beneath in black. From the character of the writing (of which he gives us a facsimile) the editor attributes it to the fourteenth century, conjecturing that it was brought to Italy about the time of the capture of Constantinople, to aid the dogmatic discussions intended to reconcile the ecclesiastical differences of the East and West. In this manuscript St. James comes first, St. Paul last, while the Acts and Revelation are omitted. In the exegesis an important difference exists, inasmuch as Euthymius, when commenting on St. Paul, relies upon his own resources; whereas, in reference to the Catholic Epistles, he borrows from other commentators, which, while detracting from the originality of his explanations, has yet preserved valuable fragments of Chrysostom, Severus, Theodore, Cyril, Didymus, and others. No commentary is given on the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the authenticity of which, from a remark on 1 Cor. xv. 52,<sup>1</sup> Euthymius might be thought to call in question, and therefore the non-existence of a commentary on that book does not surprise us; but this does not apply to the Acts of the Apostles, and the editor concludes with a hope that this, which has so long eluded his search, may be one day discovered by a more fortunate investigator than himself—an aspiration which we most heartily re-echo. Space forbids us to do more than glance at the history of Euthymius himself, the main facts of his life being drawn from the pages of the Princess Anna Commena, with whose father, the Emperor Alexius, Euthymius lived on terms of familiarity. He was born probably about the middle of the eleventh century, and distinguished himself in the study of grammar, rhetoric, and theology. As a monk he attached himself to the famous monastery of the Blessed Virgin Mary, founded by the Emperor Romanus at Constantinople. About the year 1083 he attracted the notice of Alexius, which was no doubt largely due to the similarity of their tastes, both being ardent champions of orthodoxy against heresy. Like our own James I., the Byzantine emperor was versed in theology, and Euthymius on two occasions heard him publicly disputing against the heretics, the most notorious at that time being the Paulicians and the Bogomiles. Against the latter Euthymius wrote an 'Invective' (*Στρλιτευτικόν*), as well as a 'Panoply against all Heretics.' The exact year of his death is unknown; but we learn that he outlived Alexius, who died in the year 1118.

As regards the controverted authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it may be observed that St. Paul's name is omitted from the title, though Euthymius believes that it was written by that Apostle, who concealed his name lest the Jews of Palestine, for whom he intended it, should reject it if they saw that St. Paul was the author, because he endeavoured to draw men from the Law to the Gospel. He records a tradition that St. Paul wrote it in Hebrew, while Clement of Rome translated it into Greek.

<sup>1</sup> ὡς ἐπτά μὲν τότε σαλπίγγων ἡχεῖν μελλουσῶν, ὡς ἡ λεγομένη Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου διδάσκει.

Altogether, amid the mass of commentaries, English and foreign, which flood the press, this one strikes us as being singularly fresh, suggestive, and reverential, while a special interest attaches to it owing to the time at which the author lived and his remarkable surroundings. We must therefore feel deeply grateful to the distinguished Greek prelate whose zeal, industry, and learning have placed this important Commentary in our hands.

1. *A Story of the Church of England.* By J. F. (London : S.P.C.K., 1889.)
2. *An Epitome of Anglican Church History.* By ELLEN WEBLEY PARRY. Abridged Edition. (London : Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1889.)
3. *Historical Sketches of the English Church.* By the Rev. GEORGE MILLER. (London : Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1888.)
4. *Twelve Hundred Questions on the History of England.* (London : Rivingtons, 1888.)

1. THE SUBJECT of English Church history has of late years come very much to the front. Its study has been strongly recommended by bishops and others in authority ; and the Disestablishment alarm of 1885 has called attention to the impregnable position which the Church of England holds when regarded from an historical point of view. The consequence is that epitomes, manuals, abridgments, *et id genus omne*—good, bad, and indifferent—have poured forth in rich abundance from the press during the last four or five years. Four such little works, all published quite recently, lie before us. Of these the shortest, with the humblest title, which stands first on our list, is by far the best. The story is evidently the production of one who is a thorough master—or mistress—of the subject. All the salient points of our Church's eventful history are well brought out ; the facts are very accurately stated ; and the style is bright and lively. The story is told in the form of a dialogue between a blacksmith, who is a curious mixture of great shrewdness and great simplicity, his preternaturally sharp daughter, Patty, and a Mr. Wood, a most superior person, who has all the facts of Church history at his fingers' ends. A more satisfactory little book to place in the hands of the many, alas ! whose minds are an absolute blank as far as the history of their own Church goes, it would be difficult to conceive.

2. IT would be too little to say that this book compresses within the space of three hundred pages the whole history of the English Church. The writer actually begins with the invasion of Julius Cæsar, fifty-five years before the Christian era, and ends with the second Lambeth Conference of 1878, while more than a proportionate share is occupied with a subject of pressing interest at the present time—the history of the Church in Wales. Of course, a work covering so vast a field in so short a compass can only touch upon the most prominent facts ; but it is of vital importance that these facts should be accurately stated, and that no space should be wasted upon topics not strictly germane to the matter in hand. Our authoress writes pleasantly and readably,

but she certainly does not fulfil these conditions, as a few instances will show. One hardly expects at this time of day to see it boldly stated that 'the University of Oxford owes its foundation to King Alfred,' and still less that 'he built and endowed three colleges, to which he appointed learned teachers' (p. 46); nor yet that Charles V. was 'Emperor of Germany' (p. 104). It is perhaps a matter of opinion as to the amount of 'gratitude and reverence we owe to Archbishop Cranmer' (p. 113); but it is a matter of fact, not of opinion, that John Rogers was a prebendary, not 'a prebend, of St. Paul's' (p. 118), that Dr. Hacket was Bishop of Lichfield, not 'of Lincoln' (p. 235), that Sir John Pakington's residence was in Worcestershire, not 'in Warwickshire' (p. 241), that the 'Religious Societies' and the 'Societies for the Reformation of Manners,' which our authoress muddles up together, were in reality quite different institutions (p. 257). 'Giraldus Cambrensis' (p. 70) is a gentleman we never heard of, nor is the expression 'lay appropriations' (p. 104) a very familiar one to us; and we really do not know what meaning to attach to the remarkable statement that 'good works were taking the place of justification' (p. 42). One would have thought, again, that when every inch of space was valuable, quotations of whole stanzas from universally known hymns (see pp. 286, 293) were hardly necessary, nor yet such very vague descriptions as 'Eusebius, a very ancient historian' (p. 2), and 'the great and good bishop, Athanasius' (p. 7).

3. MR. MILLER'S *Sketches* are open to similar objections. Here again we have a vast subject compressed within a very short compass (223 pages); it comprises the whole history not only of the Church of England, but of the Church in Great Britain, from Joseph of Arimathæa to the Reform Bill. The start is not very promising. We are told that there were 'English bishops on behalf of the English Church' at the Council of Arles (p. 6) in 314 A.D.; that is, some ages before such a place as England was ever heard of. We read such strange names as 'Selcey' (p. 52), Cloveshov (p. 55), 'Aldhem' (a few lines further down the same person appears as 'Aldhen') (p. 56), Bishop Burnett (p. 222), 'the Stewarts,' meaning the old royal family (p. 201). We learn, to our surprise, that Thomas Ken was Bishop of Winchester (p. 220), and that William III. was 'one of our German sovereigns' (p. 221), and that John Wesley 'took the idea of his class meetings from the Societies for the Reformation of Manners' (p. 223), to which they did not bear the faintest resemblance, though they may have been an exceedingly inferior reproduction of the Religious Societies. It is quite news to us that any Richard Grimshaw was ever incumbent of Haworth, and that the Grimshaw who was incumbent, and whose name was William, was 'the first promoter of the religious movement' (p. 225). We have heard of Earl Grey, but never of Lord Melbourne telling the bishops to set their house in order (p. 229), and we really cannot construe our author when he breaks out into Latin with 'Floreat Ecclesia Anglicanæ' (p. 229).

But the most wonderful of the four books is the last, viz.:

stances boldly King  
ges, to Charles V.  
tter of  
e to  
not of  
of St.  
not 'of  
was in  
ligious  
which  
different  
tleman  
p. 104)  
meaning  
taking  
again,  
whole  
hardly  
a very  
nasius'

4. THE title is sufficiently portentous, but the writer is more than as good as his word, for he gives us no less than twelve hundred and forty-one questions—a stock sufficient to set up an examiner for life. Some of the questions, too, would take up at least a large octavo volume to answer at all adequately. For instance, 'Q. 1101. Give a short sketch of the controversies on the Holy Trinity, Deism, and the Eucharist.' 'Q. 1112. What were Hume's propositions about miracles? Answer them.' The writer mercifully gives some 'answer-hints,' but unfortunately these answers rather look like a choice selection of instances of how *not* to do it. What, we should like to know, would an examiner think of an examinee who, in reply to a question, 'What is the evidence for' so and so? should begin his answer point-blank, 'None whatever'? Or, in reply to another, should end his answer, 'The question is very difficult.' With this very satisfactory 'answer-hint' the volume concludes—and so will we, after having given the student one piece of advice. The author tells us in his Preface that 'his pupils using this book with the *Students' English Church History* have found it (query, 'this book' or the 'history') very serviceable.' Our advice is to stick to the *Students' English Church History*, an admirable book, and leave the 1241 questions—and answer-hints—alone.

*Diocesan Histories*: 1. *St. Davids*. By Canon BEVAN, 1888. 2. *Carlisle*. By R. S. FERGUSON, Chancellor of Carlisle, 1889. (London : S.P.C.K.)

THE thought that strikes one on reading these and other diocesan histories in the same excellent series is, 'What an immense amount of intellectual reserve-force there must be in the Church of England!' The writers in many cases are local men whose literary power has not been previously known, and yet how well, as a rule, have they executed an exceptionally difficult task! They have to pack into a compass of 200 pages, more or less, an amount of information extending over hundreds of years, which might fill volumes; they have to resist the temptation to exaggerate the importance of matters in which, as local men, they naturally take the deepest interest; they have to contend against the inevitable drawback of being obliged to repeat what has been said, or will be said, by others. Much, e.g., of what is said about the Welsh Church in *St. Davids*, must reappear in St. Asaph, Bangor, and Llandaff. The two volumes now before us are quite up to the average of the series. We do not say that they are easy reading; such very condensed summaries hardly can be; and Canon Bevan has to contend against the further difficulty of making English people interested in names which they cannot pronounce. On the other hand, there is a romantic interest about the diocese of the far West, as there is about the border diocese, which renders the accounts both of *St. Davids* and of *Carlisle*, in a sense, unique; and we cordially recommend both. We believe Mr. Chancellor Ferguson is the only layman who has yet contributed to the series.

1. *The Life of Blessed John Fisher.* By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT.
2. *The Story of the Catholic Hierarchy deposed by Queen Elizabeth.* By the same. (London : Burns and Oates, 1888.)

WE next come to two works on Church history, written from a very different standpoint. In the *Life of Fisher* a learned and saintly man is used as a convenient peg on which to hang a Roman Catholic's sentiments about the Reformation. We cannot afford space to examine these sentiments in detail. But, regarding the book merely in a literary and artistic light, we would venture to hint that the writer might have given a far more attractive picture of his hero if he had used less violent language towards his opponents. The accident of Queen Elizabeth's birth, whatever we may think of the most famous of all divorce cases, was no fault of hers ; and to stigmatize her as 'Henry's bastard and shameless daughter' (p. 441) is, to speak plainly, not very gentlemanly ; neither is it language calculated to commend Mr. Bridgett to his fellow-countrymen, the vast majority of whom regard Elizabeth, in spite of all her faults, as a great monarch, under whom the country rose to an unprecedented state of prosperity. Luther 'left to sink in his own filth' (p. 138) is another specimen of the elegant modes of expression in which the volume abounds.

*The Story of the Catholic Hierarchy*, by the same author, is written in a similar strain. In the very first paragraph of the Preface, Elizabeth is again described as 'Henry's illegitimate daughter' ; in p. 10 Dean Hook is accused of 'gross ignorance' of what he ought to have known ; in p. 108 Lord Burghley is charged with 'writing what is utterly false, and what he knew to be false' ; and many similar elegant extracts might be made. Mr. Bridgett should, of course, know best what is most likely to serve his own cause, but we should have thought that such language was not calculated to serve any cause.

*The Character and Times of Thomas Cromwell: a Sixteenth Century Criticism.* By ARTHUR GALTON. (Birmingham : Cornish Brothers, 1887.)

THIS book appears to be the work of an outsider who has no particular sympathy with any of the contending parties in those fiercely controversial times. It cannot be said that the biographer of Thomas Cromwell, like the biographer of John Fisher, has spoiled a good subject, for Cromwell could never have been made an attractive subject, nor his life an edifying study. It is rather a misnomer to call the book 'a criticism,' for until we come to the last thirty or forty pages we have simply a sketch of the well-known incidents of the Reformation era. The writer calls the late Mr. Matthew Arnold 'my master in criticism,' whose style is 'my delight and my despair.' We cannot bid him despair no longer, for the only thing which the disciple seems to have learnt from his master is a certain flippancy which to reverent minds is very painful. Such sarcastic expressions (for the context clearly shows that they are sarcastic) as 'the Church on earth and the other provinces of the supernatural confederation' (p. 19)—

(we have not the slightest idea what he means), 'the sinners of Boston and the publicans of the Apostolic revenues' (p. 20), 'no less a person than Joseph of Arimathæa' (p. 148), 'the apocalyptic amenities' (p. 189), do not in the least savour of the delicate irony of Matthew Arnold; nor do the writer's historical statements at all remind us of his other mentor, Bishop Stubbs. Fancy Bishop Stubbs using such an expression as 'Henry's infant Church' (p. 29), or borrowing without acknowledgement, and ante-dating by several centuries, Voltaire's dictum about the Holy Roman Empire ceasing to be holy or Roman, or an empire at all! (p. 172) Whether it is the author or the printer who is responsible for such strange words as 'incompleted,' 'manipulated,' 'celebrate,' 'indispensable,' &c., they should at any rate be corrected, for they do not add to the beauty of the book.

1. *Arcady for Better, for Worse.* By the Rev. Dr. A. JESSOPP. Popular Edition.
2. *The Coming of the Friars and other Historic Essays.* By the same. (London : Fisher Unwin, 1887 and 1889.)

THESE two volumes are from the pen of that brilliant and fascinating writer, Dr. A. Jessopp. Both consist of articles originally contributed to the *Nineteenth Century*, which now reappear in a collected form, the latter 'with alterations, corrections, and additions.' To praise such writings would indeed be 'to gild refined gold, to paint the lily.' Everybody will read them, and everybody will admire them; so, by way of variety, we will venture to offer a little adverse criticism. Just in proportion to their popularity it is important that they should be in no way misleading. But there is one passage in *The Coming of the Friars* which appears to us most misleading, and that on a most serious and practical matter. It contains a series of statements to every one of which we demur *in toto*. It will be found on pages 47-49. 'St. Francis,' writes Dr. Jessopp, emphasizing his statements with all the force of italics, '*was the John Wesley of the thirteenth century, whom the Church did not cast out*', implying, as the context shows, that the Church of the eighteenth century *did* cast out John Wesley. But when? How? The question has been frequently asked, but never answered, for the best of all reasons. 'Rome has never been afraid of fanaticism. She has always known how to utilize her enthusiasts fired by a new idea.' Wycliffe was an enthusiast fired with a new idea, so was Luther, so were the Jansenists, so were the Waldenses, so were the Albigenses; and how admirably Rome utilized them all! On the other hand, 'the Church of England has never known how to deal with a man of genius.' And therefore, of course, there have been no men of genius among her devoted sons; and Hooker and Butler, and Jeremy Taylor and South, and Waterland and Stubbs, and Pusey and Keble, and countless others were either mere Mrs. Harrisises or not Church of England men at all! The Church of England, again, has been a 'stickler for the narrowest uniformity,' and therefore the distinctions of High, Low, and Broad Churchmen are all mere *façons de parler*, and do not at all mean that she embraces within her ample folds men of the most various minds! Well, one

lives and learns ; but one thing we confess *does* puzzle us. Among those whom the narrowness of the Church of England, in contrast with the large-heartedness of Rome, drove from her pale was Wycliffe. But are we dreaming, or is it true, that against this very Wycliffe the large-hearted Rome issued no less than five papal bulls? And did she never burn heretics? And is it possible that she would not have regarded as a heretic one who differed from her half as widely as Dr. Rowland Williams differed from the plainest tenets of that Church which is accused by Dr. Jessopp of persecuting him? It is never a very gracious office for a clergyman to deprecate his own Church. If he is forced to do so he should be very sure of his ground ; but Dr. Jessopp has, we fear, been following that most dangerous of all guides in matters of Church history, Lord Macaulay, who has led him, will-o'-the-wisp-like, into very unsafe ground indeed.

*Colloquies on Preaching.* By Canon TWELLS.  
(London : Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889.)

THIS is a delightful book, which both preachers and hearers of sermons might study with the greatest advantage. Not only is it full of the most excellent advice to both, but it is also, what one would hardly expect from the title, most amusing reading. Not that the writer ever forgets for a moment the serious nature of his subject ; but from the days of Addison downwards it has been found that true humour is not only compatible with, but much enhanced by, serious surroundings.

*The Ritual of the New Testament.* By the Rev. T. E. BRIDGETT.  
Third Edition. (London : Burns and Oates, 1887.)

THIS is, in our opinion, a much more satisfactory work than the other two volumes by the same author, which have been already noticed. Many of his arguments seem to us quite unanswerable, and might certainly be used with as great force by Anglo- as by Roman-Catholics. Of course, he lumps together as Protestants all who do not accept the Roman system. That opens out too wide a question for us to discuss now ; but we must respectfully decline to be identified with poor Dr. Cumming, now dead and gone, or with Dr. Robert Vaughan, or John Milton, or Henry Ward Beecher, or Lord Macaulay : and these are the writers against whose views on Ritual Mr. Bridgett's arguments are mainly directed.

*Philosophy of Ritual—Apologia pro Ritu.* By L. P. GRATACAP.  
(New York : James Pott and Co., 1887.)

IN this book we approach the same subject as in that just noticed, but from quite a different side. The writer is an American, which may account for his use of an expression in his very first sentence which will sound pleonastic in the ears of English Churchmen. He speaks of 'the Episcopal Church,' as if there could be a true Church which was not episcopal! He is, however, as his book shows, a good Churchman, and his defence of Ritualism is thoroughly sound and able. His work is divided into two parts. In the first he shows that

Ritual  
he q  
hurrie  
Rom  
thea  
religi  
ness  
compe  
ing ch  
Ritual  
Rom  
have h

A Ch  
fe  
th

I t  
the hu  
is an  
Churc  
emine  
into th  
exhaus  
the ne  
been t  
school,  
should  
upon.

Sunday

FROM  
subject  
the sett  
be foun  
staff a  
Hessey  
historic  
the vo  
variety  
agree i  
being p  
mere S  
is calle

Sorrow,

Such is  
which w

Ritualism is universal, 'a cosmopolitan instinct'; and, to prove this, he quite takes one's breath away by the rapidity with which he hurries the reader on from Irvingism to the Greek Church and the Roman Church, and the ancient Egyptians and the Brahmins and the Buddhists—in short, to use his own exhaustive title, through 'the religions of the world.' In his second part he shows the reasonableness of Ritual, making art, symbolism, commemoration the three component parts of the ritualistic habit in worship. In his concluding chapter he dwells, among other things, upon the fact that the Ritualism of the Catholic Church is by no means identical with Romanism—a distinction to which more space might with advantage have been given.

*A Church Sunday School Handbook: Manual of Practical Instructions for the Management of Church Sunday Schools.* Compiled by the Rev. E. P. CACHEMAILE. Fourth Edition. (London: 1888.)

It may seem rather a bathos to pass from the last ambitious work to the humble subject of Sunday Schools; but the theme, if less exalted, is an equally important one. The above book is issued by the Church of England Sunday School Institute. True to its title, it is eminently practical, giving good advice of all kinds, and entering into the minutest details of management. It would have been quite exhaustive, in its kind, if it had brought out a little more prominently the necessity of distinctive Church teaching. The lack of this has been the weakness of Sunday Schools. The most perfectly organized school, with the very best appliances and accessories, will fail in what should be its main object, if this point is not very strongly insisted upon.

*Sunday and Recreation.* Edited by the Rev. R. LINKLATER, D.D. (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh, 1889.)

FROM Sunday Schools we pass by a sort of natural transition to the subject of Sunday generally. A most helpful contribution towards the settlement of a question which is now being much agitated may be found in the volume before us. The editor has enlisted in his staff a number of recognized authorities headed by Archdeacon Hessey, whose 'Bampton Lectures' are the *locus classicus* on the historical aspect of Sunday, but one of the very best contributions to the volume is Dr. Linklater's own preface. There is some little variety of opinion in the different writers on points of detail, but all agree in essential points; all are in favour of *some* kind of recreation being permitted, and indeed encouraged; all are equally opposed to mere Sabbatarianism on the one hand, and to the imitation of what is called the 'Continental Sunday' on the other.

*Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty.* Three short series of Addresses by R. C. MOBERLY. (London: Rivingtons, 1889.)

SUCH is the title of a singularly thoughtful and suggestive little volume which we heartily commend to all readers who are not afraid of

bracing themselves up to some mental effort (for it is not very easy reading), and who can appreciate culture, scholarship, and spiritual earnestness.

*Studies of the Life and Character of St. Peter.* By the Rev. H. A. BIRKS. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1887.)

THIS is rather a disappointing book. The subject is of course a deeply interesting one, but there is nothing specially vivid or original in the writer's treatment of it. If one compares it with A. Monod's treatment of St. Paul in his sermons on that great apostle, the contrast is very marked. Even those who, like ourselves, disagree with much of Monod's theology, cannot help being struck with the lifelike portrait. But it is not so with this picture of St. Peter. Anyone who attempted such a task ought either to have the gift of vivid description or a wealth of learning which might throw some new light upon the apostle's life or character. Otherwise he had better leave such a subject alone.

*A Pastoral Letter from the Right Rev. C. W. Sandford, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar, to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.* (Parker and Co., 1889.)

THIS letter gives interesting information as to the Bishop's work both in Southern Europe and Northern Africa. We have so much sympathy with him in a difficulty to which he prominently refers in connection with the growing evils of Monte Carlo, that we sincerely hope he will neither surrender nor compromise. He quotes from papers by the chaplain of St. Paul's, Cannes, and the chaplain of St. John's, Mentone. The former said :—

'At Monte Carlo there is a running sore which is never healed, a mephitic exhalation perpetually poisoning the atmosphere of the Riviera. Vice there puts on its most smiling aspect' (p. 6).

The latter adds :—

'The gambling is only a lesser evil. The immorality of the place is its worst feature. At Monte Carlo there is a dangerously narrow borderland between fastness and positive vice. As for respectable people who go there to hear the music, do they ever think of the broken hearts and ruined reputations which have paid for it, or remember that it is in very truth the price of blood?' (*ibid.*)

The Bishop has declined to establish an ordinary chaplain at Monte Carlo, and some years since refused to support a project for building a church there. But a church has been built, and services are held there, though the Bishop has not been asked to consecrate it. Some physicians seem to be in the habit of recommending Monte Carlo as a health resort, and there is a small number of English residents at the place, warned by the Bishop, who insists that Monte Carlo is not a fit and safe place of residence for our countrymen, and that they ought not even to visit the place. But, as he says, the question is full of difficulty. The Charge states the *pros* and *cons* as well. As we can easily understand, interested people want, by means

of a c  
and t  
at res  
might  
sorry  
Engli  
and v

The  
himself  
Divin  
'specia  
consci  
Medit  
posed  
not be  
are fo  
them  
sparro  
faith i  
not of  
ness fo  
of Er  
those  
means  
of Gib  
of the  
congru  
fashion

Too mu  
ce

O  
We sin  
for dim  
out.  
double  
certain  
Would  
An inc  
life, vi  
Irelan  
be a de  
tunity i  
sees o  
confess  
seem a  
facts.  
a regi  
that a l

VOL

of a chaplain, to give a false semblance of respectability to the place and to set the minds and consciences of some resident Englishmen at rest, and dispel the misgivings which the prevailing wickedness might awaken as to the propriety of residing there. We shall be sorry to hear of the Bishop taking any step which will make an English family less sensitive to the horrors of this den of temptation and vice.

The Gibraltar Mission to Seamen is another of the topics of this letter. We are a little at a loss to understand why the Bishop allowed himself to write a special prayer for it, to be used once a week during Divine Service. It seems to us that there will be no end of such 'special' Collects if we once begin such work. This one might be considered as applicable to Great Britain and Ireland as to the Mediterranean, and then there are the pitmen and other classes exposed to exceptional dangers! This over-anxiety and particularity have not been the Church's way, but very much the reverse. When men are following a lawful vocation and doing their duty in it, she commits them to the holy care and keeping of God, who has a care even for the sparrow. Her part is to see that generally men in all vocations have faith in God, and a noble sense of duty. Our manner of death is not of the first importance in the Church's eye, but only our preparedness for it. A weak methodism seems to be stealing over the Church of England. This prayer is framed on the grandiloquent type of those in 'Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea,' which are not by any means the best models. And why bring in *nominativum* the 'Diocese of Gibraltar' instead of 'this diocese'? Why, too, couple 'the perils of the deep' with 'the hour of temptation'? Surely this is very incongruous. In real prayer, petitions are not jostled together in that fashion.

*Too many Bishops.* Some remarks on a re-arrangement of the Dioceses of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. By H. EDEN OLIVIER, B.A. (Edinburgh: St. Giles's Printing Co., 1889.)

WE sincerely hope that the scheme proposed by Mr. H. Eden Olivier for diminishing the number of Bishops in Scotland may not be carried out. The Church population and staff of clergy have well nigh doubled during the last twenty years, and the step suggested would certainly imply a shrinking in numbers of both priests and people. Would it be politic, or truthful even, to imply that this is the case? An increase in the number of Bishops means increase in Church life, vigour, and numbers; a decrease (as in the unhappy Church of Ireland) means decay in all points that make a Church. It would be a deep wrong to the old Church of Scotland to allow an opportunity for such a comparison to be made. The suppression of three sees out of seven would certainly be looked upon by outsiders as a confession of weakness. And, further, few of the author's arguments seem at all convincing, and some seem to be positively opposed to facts. It seems to be very undesirable to import modern ideas into a region from which they have happily been excluded; the notion that a bishop is a man always in a hurry, always travelling by rail, or,

VOL. XXIX.—NO. LVIII.

L L

as it has been expressed, always in a state of perspiration, though modern, is not good; meditation and thoughtfulness are not promoted by being in a continual nineteenth century rush. And we do not like the remarks of our author about 'the gold that gilds the straiten'd forehead of the fool' (p. 10). They are entirely out of place, if not offensive.

The pamphlet is accompanied by a useful coloured map of the dioceses of Scotland.

*English Men of Action.* (London : Macmillan & Co., 1889.)

1. *Henry the Fifth.* By the Rev. A. J. CHURCH. 2. *Monk.*  
By JULIAN CORBETT. 3. *Dampier.* By W. CLARK RUSSELL.  
4. *Wellington.* By GEORGE HOOVER. 5. *David Livingstone.*  
By THOMAS HUGHES. 6. *Lord Lawrence.* By SIR RICHARD  
TEMPLE.

1. Henry the Fifth is a rather difficult and dangerous subject for the historical biographer. His name is surrounded by the halo of the brilliantly romantic achievement of Agincourt, and our conceptions of him are inevitably coloured and heightened by the associations derived from Shakespeare. But on descending to ascertainable facts there is comparatively little material out of which to construct an interesting narrative. There is a difficulty in making many of the facts come up to his reputation. The conquest of France is fact enough, indeed, and the reputation in which he was held among his subjects and with succeeding generations testifies to the impression he produced. But for the rest the narrative of his early escapades hardly bears investigation, and his austere and almost unfeeling conduct on more occasions than one sometimes makes us feel it difficult to justify to ourselves the affection with which we traditionally regard the hero of Agincourt. Mr. Church seems to have felt the difficulty of his task. His biography is careful and conscientious, but it leaves the impression that he has failed to warm up to his work, and that he has hardly got his conception of his hero well into his head, so as to produce a vivid and connected picture of him. The narrative of the battle of Agincourt seems to lack life and vigour, and falls a little flat. Probably it is not Mr. Church's fault that it is not illustrated by a plan, without which no description of a fight can be made perfectly clear. The account of the second campaign in France, on the other hand, is brighter and better, and the sieges of Caen and Rouen are well described. Mr. Church has been careful in his consultation of authorities, but it cannot be said that he has cast much new light upon them. Indeed he handles most of the difficult problems concerning Henry's career somewhat tenderly, and generally leaves the reader with the impression that there is a good deal to be said on both sides, which may be true but is rather unsatisfactory when repeated often. This is especially the case with the question of Henry's treatment of the Lollards, on which some more space might have been bestowed with advantage. The problem of Henry's behaviour while prince, on the other hand, is dealt with at considerable length, and Mr. Church shows satisfactorily that his time

was the  
leave  
perha  
much  
John  
versi  
2  
perso  
ther  
of hi  
down  
nothi  
find  
fate  
why  
up to  
main  
foug  
the c  
Town  
he to  
strug  
Word  
task  
const  
tricat  
paign  
biogr  
right  
the c  
histo  
perso  
tion t  
babyl  
for hi  
quest  
throu  
point  
anoth  
battle  
the R  
was t  
tions,  
than  
the tw  
pulled  
was n  
the o  
period  
But f

was for the most part so fully employed, even at that early age, as to leave little leisure for revels with Falstaff at Eastcheap ; and we may perhaps conclude that the real Prince of Wales did not give very much more foundation for the portraiture of Prince Hal, than did Sir John Oldcastle for the character of the fat knight who, in the early versions of the play, bore his name.

2. Monk is not ordinarily considered a particularly interesting personage apart from the one great moment of his life, and it is therefore the more to Mr. Corbett's credit that he has written a life of him of which it may honestly be said that it is not easy to put it down until one has finished it. In the ordinary histories we hear nothing of Monk until, in the last year of the Commonwealth, we find him established in Scotland with a force sufficient to decide the fate of the country, and perhaps faintly wonder how he got there, and why we never heard of him before. The fact is that Monk's career up to that moment had always fallen upon places remote from the main centre of interest. While Edgehill and Newbury were being fought, he was striving to make head against the Irish rebels. During the campaigns of Marston Moor and Naseby he was lying in the Tower, taken prisoner at Nantwich in the first engagement in which he took part with either of the combatants in the great constitutional struggle. While Cromwell was breaking the last Royalist force at Worcester, he was engaged in the less striking but more difficult task of securing Scotland ; and while Cromwell was trying his first constitutional experiments as Protector, he was conducting an intricate mountain campaign in the Highlands. The story of his campaigns will be new to most readers, and it is well told by his biographer. Mr. Corbett writes frankly as a eulogist, a fault on the right side, unless it be excessive ; and it is the more pardonable in the case of a man whose claims have usually been overlooked by historians. Still it is probable that the impartial historian, who has other persons' claims to consider as well, will have to make some deduction from Mr. Corbett's rather enthusiastic estimate. Monk was probably a better strategist than Cromwell ; but it is ill-advised to claim for him the credit of the Dunbar campaign, when the Scotch unquestionably had the best of the strategy, and were only beaten through a blunder in tactics. Further, it is somewhat stretching a point to assign to Monk who hardly knew one end of a ship from another, the praise for the naval tactics which won the decisive battle of July 31, 1653. Even in the great crisis which led up to the Restoration, though Monk was probably fitter for the work that was to be done than a man with more developed political conceptions, it is clear that he was rather driven to the final conclusion than saw his own way to it. But Mr. Corbett brings out strongly the two characteristics to which Monk owed his career, and which pulled him through this difficulty, as they had through others. He was not an original genius and he was not a statesman ; but he was the only scientifically trained soldier in England during the whole period, and he was inflexibly true to his simple conceptions of duty. But for the former gift he would have lacked the power to bring

order out of the chaos which succeeded Oliver's death ; and but for the latter he would have been entangled in the meshes of political intrigue through which, in actual fact, he stumbled half unconsciously to the only solution possible at the time. The story of that crisis is well known, and it is here told with great life and interest ; but it was perhaps a greater feat to bring out, as Mr. Corbett has done, the rest of Monk's life into a vivid and thoroughly attractive narrative from beginning to end.

3. Probably few persons would have been more surprised than Captain William Dampier himself, if he had found himself during his life in the company which he keeps in this series, with General Monk and his Grace of Wellington rubbing elbows with him on terms of equality. And indeed it is somewhat questionable whether he quite deserves the position which he holds. He was not a great discoverer, his experiences rather tending to discredit, as useless, the discoveries which others had made. He was not a great sailor, except in the sense that he traversed a very great quantity of sea. He was assuredly not a great fighter ; and he cannot be said to have affected the destinies of his country to any noteworthy extent in any way. It may be said that he is the representative of a remarkable class of Englishmen, whose name is well known (especially in fiction) as the buccaneers. But he was not even a good buccaneer. He was no blood-and-thunder dare-devil, the terror of the seas. When he attacked an armed ship, he was generally beaten off. When he found himself alongside of a rich Spanish galleon, the very prize for which he had been waiting, he lacked either the courage or the nerve to board her. The only profitable voyage he ever made was when he was serving under a more resolute commander than himself, Captain Woodes Rogers. When he was a subordinate, as was the case during the greater part of his life, he was perpetually changing his service in a vacillating and purposeless way. When he was in command he quarrelled with his officers, and lost heart almost before his expedition had begun. It is not, as Mr. Clark Russell suggests, that he had a soul which was disgusted with the low occupation of a buccaneer. Dampier was as ready as anyone to sack a defenceless town or to board an unarmed ship ; but he had not the desperate resolution which half redeems some of the ruffianly exploits of his comrades in the profession. How, then, does it come that his name has managed to survive, while his comrades are forgotten ? It is because he had one gift which is not generally to be found in a buccaneer, that of literary composition. Most seamen, especially in those times, were necessarily men of close observation. Dampier was a still more close and careful observer than others, and what he saw 'he made a note of,' and, when occasion came, he printed it. Hence his volumes are full of quaint and most lifelike descriptions, both of living creatures and of inanimate phenomena. They bring before us in a vivid and refreshing manner the aspect which an unknown world bore to the eyes of the men who first discovered it, to the mariners who wandered, often blindly and blunderingly, about a sea whose paths were unfamiliar to them, with no trustworthy means of discovering

either where they were, or how to get to the place where they would be. They set before us a manner of life which must always be interesting to us as a naval people ; and if the manner of life of the buccaneers was not very creditable and not very savoury, we are far enough from it now to enjoy the picturesque side of it, and to recognize it as one development of that passion for roaming and vague enterprise which has so largely moulded our national history. Mr. Clark Russell has done his best with his subject. He says all that can be said for his hero (if that word is to be applied, as Mr. Clark Russell applies it, to so unheroic a person as Dampier), and even on several occasions, as is almost inevitable in a biographer, gives him credit to which he appears to have no claim. But Dampier's merit lies in his own writings, which can be but slightly reproduced in a short biography of him ; and Mr. Russell is evidently painfully conscious that neither his character nor his achievements are in themselves capable of bearing a very searching examination.

4. To say that Wellington's career as a Man of Action was over when he returned from France in 1818, as Mr. Hooper does, seems to be rather a bold assertion. No doubt Wellington was a great soldier, and was not, in the ordinary sense of the term, a great statesman. But his position in the country, and his influence on the course of affairs, above all the high standard of duty to the public service which won him, in a unique degree visible in all the memoirs of the period, the respect of all parties, deserve, in themselves, more space than the twenty pages which Mr. Hooper devotes to them. But the picture of the Duke in the last thirty-four years of his life cannot be properly drawn in the limits prescribed by the series to which this volume belongs, without cramping too much the far more important narrative of his achievements as a soldier ; and Mr. Hooper, as a student of military history, probably felt little reluctance in deciding to devote practically the whole volume to the relation of his campaigns in India, the Peninsula, and Belgium.

In this task he has not been called upon to make any original researches. With Gurwood and Napier before him, there was little to be done beyond boiling these down into a narrative of the pre-scribed dimensions. In the case of the Peninsular War, in particular, those who are acquainted with Napier will find nothing new in Mr. Hooper's account. This is, perhaps, inevitable, and Mr. Hooper has done his work as abridger clearly and intelligently, though occasionally, in trying to pass over as little as possible in his narrative, he makes allusions which will hardly be intelligible to those unacquainted with the larger work. Unfortunately, the plan of the series appears to admit of no maps, and hence it was perhaps ill-advised of Mr. Hooper to insert so many topographical details ; for, in many cases, his descriptions are only intelligible by the aid of Napier's maps, and the reader who possesses Napier will hardly look further for an account of the Peninsular War. The narrative of the campaign and battle of Salamanca suffers particularly from this cause.

However, the whole history of Wellington's campaigns is told with sympathy and ability, his Indian services in particular receiving

an amount of attention proportionately greater than usual. Of independent criticism there is little or nothing, except in one passage, where Mr. Hooper defends Wellington against the charge made by Lord Wolseley of want of sympathy with his men. Mr. Hooper's defence is somewhat beside the point. There can be no doubt that the Duke's Peninsular army *trusted* him thoroughly, and would have followed him anywhere and done anything. But there does not seem to have been that sense of personal affection which some commanders have established between themselves and their men. Wellington was aristocratic to the backbone in his tastes and prejudices ; and his conversations with Lord Stanhope supply the proof that he could speak of his old troops in terms which we cannot conceive of Cæsar or Frederick or Napoleon as using. But this need not obscure the fact that Wellington did more, with less resources, certainly than any other English general, and more than any except a very few among the generals of all time. He made no single campaign so brilliant as Marlborough's in 1704, or Frederick's in 1757, or Napoleon's in 1796 or 1805, but no general in modern war made so few bad mistakes, and he showed in the campaigns of Talavera, of Salamanca, and of Vittoria, that he did not lack the decision to strike boldly when he had the opportunity. In soundness and judgment no general excelled him ; he never lost a battle, though he seldom or never had the advantage in numbers ; and alike in the Peninsula and at Waterloo he proved himself the saviour of England and of Europe.

5. The life of Livingstone is beginning, it is to be feared, to be forgotten already, and it is therefore satisfactory to find the story of his work put once more before the world in an interesting and attractive shape. It is a life, moreover, which has a right to a leading place in such a series as this, because it is typical of one form of activity which is a marked characteristic of Englishmen, that, namely, of the traveller and explorer. The story of it does not suffer in the hands of Mr. Hughes. It is, of course, based almost entirely on Livingstone's own books and journals, but the work of piecing the extracts together is well done, and the narrative has a continuity and uniformity which is not always found in such compositions. It is clear, straightforward, and sympathetic, and it gives a most attractive sketch of a singularly fine character. Dealing with such a man and with such work, it could hardly fail to be interesting.

There is, indeed, a special interest connected with Livingstone's work at the present time. He was no mere explorer, whose interest is confined to solving disputed questions of geography. Beginning as a missionary, in all his travels his first thought was of the condition of the natives, and especially he felt to his inmost heart the terrible problem of the slave trade. One of the most difficult questions connected with the work of the explorer or the missionary is directly suggested by the life of Livingstone. He (especially in his first journey) opened up country to which no other traveller had penetrated ; but in his track, as in the track of other explorers elsewhere, followed the slave-dealer, and large tracts of country, which

were peaceful and prosperous when he saw them on his first journey, he found on his second devastated and deserted. The question cannot but force itself upon one, Is it worth while, is it even right, to open up a country, even in the name of Christianity, if we thereby expose it to the awful evils of the slave trade? The duty of preaching the Gospel must be admitted to be paramount, but one thing is certain, that in doing work such as England has been foremost to do in Africa and elsewhere, she has undertaken a very serious responsibility. Having brought European civilization into contact with savage nations, we are bound by every moral claim to do our best to put down the slave trade and to forward the spread of Christianity. No one is more representative of this work and of this duty than Livingstone. His constant care for the natives with whom he came into contact, his constant avoidance of all occasions of quarrel and of all resort to force, are lessons to all his followers in the field of African exploration. He first enforced on the English public the character of the work to be done in that country. The Universities Mission to Central Africa was established under his advice, and as a direct consequence of his visits to Oxford and Cambridge in 1858; and from the impetus which it received after the news of his death, its work, and that of other missions started at the same time, has gone steadily and encouragingly forward. At present, however, there is a check. The successes of the Arabs throughout Central Africa, and the disorders caused by the proceedings of the German Company, have seriously endangered the work; and it is, therefore, at a good time that Mr. Hughes's book has appeared to remind Englishmen of the past history of that part of the continent. The story is interesting in itself; it is still more valuable as a reminder of a work undertaken by England which it would be a dereliction of national duty to abandon.

6. It is clearly right that the achievements of Englishmen in India should be fully represented in this series, and with Clive and Warren Hastings from the generation which won and organized India, and John Lawrence and Havelock from that which saved it at the crisis of the Mutiny, there is no need to complain. In one respect the writers who have to deal with the second group are at a disadvantage. The histories and biographies which treat of the period of the Mutiny are so numerous, and for the more part so good, that most persons who are interested in that portion of our history have heard its story told more than once with much greater detail than is possible in a book of two hundred pages. The most striking and important part of Lord Lawrence's life is the maintenance of the Punjab and the recapture of Delhi; yet it is precisely this part of Sir Richard Temple's work which many readers will find the most disappointing.

This, however, was inevitable, and for the rest, no person could be found in a better position to write the life of Lord Lawrence than Sir Richard Temple. Apart from his general Indian experience Sir Richard had especial means of becoming intimately acquainted with his hero, for he was his secretary when he was plain John Lawrence of the Punjab, and on his council when he was governor-general of

India. Therefore in all that relates to Lawrence's methods of business, his organization, his personal character, his devotion to duty, his energy, and that power of surrounding himself with lieutenants of first-class ability, which was in the end one of the chief causes of the preservation of the Punjab and of India—in all this Sir Richard is an excellent authority, and his narrative is interesting and valuable. The summary of the administration of India could not have been placed in more competent hands. In fact, the matter of the book is excellent throughout; all that can be reasonably complained of is the manner. Sir Richard Temple's style is an unfortunate one. It is too self-conscious. The reader is never able to forget the presence of the biographer; and, pleasant though that presence may doubtless be, it is still pleasanter to be left alone with the hero. There are many books in which one is content to enjoy the author's style without greatly caring what he is writing about; but a biography is not a work of this description, and Sir Richard Temple's is not precisely the style which we should select for its own sake. In spite of this defect, however, the book contains an interesting narrative of the life of one of the foremost among the brilliant band of soldiers and administrators (and John Lawrence was nearly as much soldier as he was administrator), whose sudden appearance at the greatest crisis of our foreign empire is one of the most comforting features of the history of England in the present century.

*Apostolic Fathers*, Part ii. *St. Ignatius : St. Polycarp. Revised Texts, with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations.* By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Bishop of Durham. Second edition, 1889.

THE preface to this second edition of the late Bishop of Durham's monumental treatise on SS. Ignatius and Polycarp is dated September 1, 1889. Alas! that before this short notice is written it has become necessary to insert the word *late* before the great and learned Bishop's name.

The appearance of the first edition was hailed with acclamation, and a consensus of critical opinion agreed in considering the controversy as settled in favour of the middle form of the Ignatian epistles, and the earlier date for the martyrdom of Polycarp. We remember with satisfaction that nowhere was the work received with more appreciative, though discriminating, criticism than in the pages of this Review;<sup>1</sup> and we regard it as no slight indication of the revival of an intelligent interest in patristic studies on the part of English scholars, that a large edition of a work so extensive and learned as this should in so short a time have been exhausted.

The Bishop had the satisfaction of announcing in his preface to the second edition new converts to the view of the Ignatian letters which he had done more than any man to establish, and among them M. de Pressensé. He had the still greater satisfaction of announcing fresh gleanings of new materials in a field where he had himself

<sup>1</sup> See *Church Quarterly Review*, No. 42, January 1886.

gathered every fragment before : portions of the original Syriac version as distinguished from the Curetonian abridgment, two unknown MSS. of the Greek Antiochene Acts with the Epistle to the Romans (hitherto preserved only in a single MS.), the Thebaic version of the Roman Acts of Ignatius, a Greek MS. of the Letter of the Smyrnæans, an important Pergamene inscription, some new inscriptions relating to Philippus of Tralles. A few corrections and additions have also been made, though it is remarkable how little need the test of years furnished for corrections in a work of this extent and complication. The form has been improved by a new numbering of the volumes, and the whole has been subjected, in great things and in small things, to careful re-examination. And the work remains to us, with almost the last thoughts of the author's mind and the last touch of his hand, *consensu omnium* the greatest patristic work of this century. One addition which the Bishop made must be told in his own touching words. It was a great joy to him to receive a visit at Auckland Castle during the summer from his old friend and colleague, Canon Liddon, and the work is now dedicated in the following terms :—‘To Henry Parry Liddon, D.D. To whom God has given Special gifts as a Christian preacher And matched the gifts with the opportunities Assigning to him his place Beneath the great dome of St. Paul's The centre of the world's concourse This work is dedicated As a tribute of admiration and affection From a former colleague.’

We cannot but ask—who among our readers will not ask?—what other work of the great scholar Bishop is likely to be given to the Church. *Dies docebit*; but statements have appeared which seem to give some trustworthy indication. His library has been left by will to the University of Durham and the Selwyn Divinity School, Cambridge; the division of books to be made at the discretion of the executors, who are Archdeacon Watkins, the Rev. G. R. Eden, and the Rev. J. R. Harmer. The residue of the estate, including the copyrights of all published works and the MSS., is left in trust for the diocese of Durham. All the executors have had full opportunity of knowing their Bishop's thoughts and work, and Mr. Harmer has fulfilled to the Bishop's own full satisfaction the task of assisting him during his illness in editorial work. It is to Mr. Harmer's scholarship and devotion, that we are indebted for the possession of the present edition at so early a date, and it is believed that other works—among them the new edition of *S. Clement*, bringing it up to the standard and fulness of the present work, a student's edition of the whole of the *Apostolic Fathers* with introductions and a translation, and a treatise on the Lord's Prayer—are nearly ready for publication. It is impossible not to hope that more than one volume of sermons—Cambridge, London, Durham—a volume of charges to ordination candidates, and a volume of occasional papers will be given to us. And may we not hope for something more on the Epistles of St. Paul? It is said that much has been written, and we will cherish the hope that when these papers are examined, they may be found in a state which will warrant their publication. The trustees will have a serious

responsibility. We are thankful to believe that it is in safe hands, and to know that it is in hands which the Bishop himself chose. The Bishop's Cambridge colleagues, Professors Westcott and Hort, will, it may be hoped, afford their counsel and assistance ; and it is a providential circumstance for which we may well be thankful, that Mr. Harmer has had special and long continued training under the Bishop's own eye for the work to which we trust that he will now feel himself to be specially called.

1. *The Holy Land and the Bible, a book of Scripture illustrations in Palestine.* By CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D. (London : Cassell and Co., 1887.)
2. *Modern Science in Bible Lands.* By Sir J. W. DAWSON. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1888.)

1. DR. GEIKIE's work may be described as the diary of a tour in Palestine kept by one who had a thorough knowledge of his Bible. The author commenced his tour at Joppa, and, after passing through Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem, finally reached Damascus, Baalbek, and Beyrouth. Thus he traversed the whole of Western Palestine. It is not an ordinary book of travel : it contains no adventures, no original explorations, no identifications of lost sites. The author

'visited Palestine with the intention of gathering illustrations of the sacred writings from its hills and valleys, its rivers and lakes, its plants and animals, its skies, its soil, and, above all, from the pictures of ancient times still presented on every side in the daily life of its people. Nothing is more interesting when reading scripture than the illumination of its texts from such sources' (*Pref.*).

Accordingly he notes down everything he saw which illustrates the Bible. When he passes a biblical site, such as Adullam, he shows how the physical features of the place illustrate the story of David. Above all, he has an eye to the manners and customs of the natives. A midnight wedding at Bethlehem reminds him of the Parable of the Ten Virgins ; and he illustrates the various marriage customs mentioned in the Bible, e.g. the shout of the friend of the bridegroom, by reference to the customs of the natives. Nor does he neglect the animals and plants of the country. After mentioning a hill called Neby Yunis (the prophet Jonah), he discusses what fish Jonah's whale was, and what plant his gourd might have been. At another time the barking of the town dogs supplies an occasion for a disquisition on these animals. We will quote the passage as a specimen of Dr. Geikie's method.

'Through the day, in the words of the prophet, which vividly describe them, "they are all dumb . . . they do not bark ; dreaming, lying down, loving to slumber" (Isa. lvi. 10) ; but after sunset they are astir, swarming through the streets and disturbing the night by their howling and uproar, as they roam about to eat up the foul offal and waste of the households, which in all Eastern towns is thrown into the public roadway. It was in reference to this that our Lord spoke when he said, " Give not that which is holy" ("clean" in the Jewish sense) "to the dogs." One needs

a good  
compli-  
ment of the  
them  
wande-  
dread-  
that i-  
when

The  
detai-  
cation  
used  
Appar-  
gener-  
Solom-

The  
unimp-  
inflict-  
(i. 132  
under  
make  
the ye-  
average  
to the  
rain fa-  
two cr-  
plains  
the ea-  
in sha-  
Geikie  
work (i-  
of the  
runs ne-  
shade  
shine.  
plain, l-  
age tun-  
should  
Conde-  
called  
thus be-  
Again  
doubt  
Memoi-  
6,500 p-  
monast-  
Jerusal-  
therefo-

a good stick to defend himself if he be abroad after dark. "Dogs have compassed me," says the Psalmist; "deliver my darling from the power of the dog." "At evening," says another Psalm, "let them return; let them make a noise like a dog, and go round about the city. They shall wander up and down for meat." Sometimes, indeed, the dogs raise a dreadful barking if a stranger in unusual dress approach the village, so that it was a pleasant assurance which Moses gave the Israelites, that when they set out from Egypt "not a dog should move his tongue against man or beast" (Ex. xi. 7) (vol. i. p. 12).

The work is not intended for scholars, but for ordinary readers of the Bible, and the author, on the whole, avoids entering on technical details. He sometimes is too ready to accept the ordinary identifications. The rainwater pool of Birket-es-Sultan, near Jerusalem, used at one time to be identified with Gihon, but few think so now. Apparently it dates from the time of the Crusades. Nor is it now generally believed that the present walls of the Temple date from Solomon's time (ii. 18). They are almost certainly Herodian.

The book is remarkably free from misprints, but there are a few unimportant mistakes. Herodotus does not say that 'a disease was inflicted on the women of Scythia for robbing the temple of Derketo' (i. 132), but on Σκύθαι, Scythian men. Sometimes the author misunderstands the authorities he has consulted. Dr. Chaplin does not make the astounding statement that 'the average number of days in the year on which rain falls' in Palestine is 188 (ii. 57), but that the average length of the rainy season from the first shower in autumn to the last in spring is 188 days; the average number of days on which rain falls is just over fifty. Again we read (ii. 174) that one of the two crags at Michmash is called Bozez, 'the shining,' 'the name explains itself at once on the spot.' The two crags face each other from the east and from the west respectively, so that one is nearly always in shade, while the other is equally favoured by sunshine.' Dr. Geikie's astronomy is puzzling. But a reference to Conder's Tent-work (p. 252) solves the difficulty. He says: 'The true explanation of the name "Bozez" only presents itself on the spot. The great valley runs nearly due east, and thus the southern cliff is almost entirely in shade during the day,' while the northern cliff is always in the sunshine. Again we are astonished to read (ii. 244) of 'a considerable plain, known as the "Meadow of Drowning," the want of natural drainage turning it into a swamp in May or June.' We wonder why it should become swampy just when there is no rain. We refer to Conder's Tent-work (p. 53) and find that he speaks of 'a small plain called the "Drowned Meadow," which has no natural drainage, and thus becomes a marsh in the winter, drying up only in May or June.' Again (i. 32) Dr. Geikie says the population of Lydda is 1,345; no doubt he got his information from the 'Palestine Exploration Fund Memoirs'; but the population is there given as 1,345 males, or about 6,500 persons. Again it is perfectly true that the manuscripts of the monastery of Mar Saba 'have been removed to a monastery near Jerusalem' (ii. 126). This was done about ten years ago. We are therefore astonished to read (ii. 132) that 'half the monks are unable

ands,  
nose.  
Hort,  
it is  
that  
er the  
v feel

ns in  
assell

don :

Pales-  
The  
rough  
ascus,  
western  
no ad-  
sites.

of the  
plants  
ncient  
othing  
n of its

strates  
shows  
David.  
atives.  
of the  
s mem-  
om, by  
ect the  
called  
Jonah's  
another  
r a dis-  
ecimen

describe  
g down,  
warming  
ng and  
e house-  
way. It  
not that  
e needs

to read the manuscripts in their library, which they nevertheless carefully guard from the eyes of heretics.' The mistake arises from copying Conder's Tent-work (p. 158), 'scarcely half the monks can read the valuable manuscripts in their library, yet they hide them carefully from the eyes of heretics'—a statement quite true when Capt. Conder wrote in 1877, but not true now. In none of these cases does Dr. Geikie make any acknowledgment to the authorities to which he is so much indebted.

These small blemishes, however, will not affect the value of the book for the ordinary reader. It is brimful of information bearing on the Bible; some 1,700 verses are referred to in the course of the two volumes; and no one will reach the end of the work without understanding his Bible a deal better in consequence. It has a very full index, and a list of passages of the Bible quoted in the work. It also contains a map on which Dr. Geikie's tour can be followed. If it had been reduced from 1,100 pages to 600 pages, by avoiding all repetition and omitting the descriptions of insignificant villages, it could confidently be recommended to all who desire to understand their Bible.

2. The early chapters of Genesis may either be treated as genuine history or as an inspired allegory. Just as in the Parables truth is taught by an imaginary story, so it may be in the early chapters of the Bible. A mythological story common to many nations may have been taken by the inspired writer as a basis on which to teach revealed truths, such as the unity of the human race and that man is fallen and needs a redeemer. This is the attitude adopted by most men of science to the story of the Creation and the Flood. But Professor Dawson, who is one of the greatest living geologists, still believes in the historical accuracy of the early chapters of Genesis. He says that geologists have discovered no traces of men before the Glacial period; and he argues from various data—such as the rate of the growth of the Mississippi delta, or the rate of retreat of the Niagara Falls—that the Glacial period ended some six or eight thousand years ago. He shows how the story of the Creation in six days, or periods, is almost exactly in harmony with the conclusions of geology. The Garden of Eden he places at the head of the Persian Gulf, that part of the country having been more elevated and salubrious in the early post-Glacial period than at present. The four rivers which flowed through Eden would be the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Choaspes, and the Pasisigris, now known as the Karun; the land of Havilah means Luristan, and 'bdellium and the onyx stone' mean 'wampum and jade,' the country round the Karun producing jade, which was the material from which primitive man would in those parts have made his implements. These are the conclusions he reaches; the reader must be referred to the work itself for the very ingenious and convincing arguments on which he bases his conclusions. Professor Dawson scorns the idea of the evolution of one species from another:

'The elephants and their allies, the deinotheres and mastodons, appear all at once in the Miocene period and in many countries, and they only dwindle in magnitude and numbers as they approach the Modern. . . .'

The  
exist  
shou  
The  
Mod  
Mioc

The  
poin  
burie  
also  
Asia  
For  
sank,  
where  
anim  
on th  
to th  
north  
and a  
destro  
erupt  
bourb  
in An  
the P  
P.  
seems  
the si  
Brach  
chips.  
told th  
not su  
'the  
Israe  
poly o  
of to-o  
the Ca  
that M

Sermo

W

THESE  
late D  
their il  
moral

'THE  
There a  
the self  
the peo  
somethe

The cetaceans, those great mammalian monsters of the deep, leap into existence in grand and highly-developed forms in the Eocene, and surely should have left some trace of their previous development in the sea. . . . The reader may note that the appearance of man fully developed in the Modern period is parallel with that of the elephantine animals in the Miocene, and the whales in the Eocene' (p. 157).

The author then discusses the geological evidence for the Flood ; points out that remains of the mammoth and primitive man are found buried in silt, in places where no stream could ever have flowed ; also that there is evidence of the greater part of Europe and Central Asia having been depressed beneath the sea in quite recent times. For these and many other reasons he holds that the land gradually sank, perhaps during 120 years, and that those parts of the world where man lived were covered with water, though many plants and animals escaped on the higher mountains. There is also a discussion on the Exodus, the author pointing out that at that time, and even up to the times of the Romans, the Red Sea extended fifty miles farther north than it does at present. Lastly, we are brought to Palestine, and among other interesting geological discussions he considers the destruction of the Cities of the Plain. It was not volcanic, but an eruption of petroleum from the bituminous limestone of the neighbourhood. This was forced out in great jets, as sometimes happens in America, and becoming ignited 'rained down fire' on the Cities of the Plain.

Professor Dawson is always an interesting writer. His knowledge seems unlimited. On one page he quotes a learned German work on the site of Paradise, on another a monograph on Trilobites and Brachiopods ; he seems equally at home in Hebrew roots and flint chips. But he is not an authority on Church matters. After being told that Abraham is 'the father of puritans and dissenters,' we are not surprised to learn that the Egyptians of the time of Moses were 'the High Church party,' apparently because they persecuted the Israelites. We should have thought that persecuting was not a monopoly of any party. Lastly, the statement that 'the Waldensian Church of to-day is the true and uninterrupted successor of the Church of the Catacombs' (p. 88) is absolutely untrue. We should have thought that Maitland had disposed for ever of this popular fallacy.

*Sermons for Children, including the Beatitudes and the Faithful Servant.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., late Dean of Westminster. (London : John Murray, 1887.)

THESE sermons have all the charm and all the attractiveness of the late Dean Stanley's writings. Their style is simple and beautiful, their illustrations are as bright and attractive as they always were, the moral teaching as pure and real. One extract will suffice :—

'There are, no doubt, many lesser kinds of happiness and virtue. There are, no doubt, many successes in life which attend on the swaggerers, the self-asserting, the commonplace, the listeners and retailers of gossip, the people who turn about with any evil wind that blows. But there is something beyond. In mountain countries there is, over and above all the

lower hills, one range, one line of lofty summits which conveys a new sense of something quite different ; and that is the range of eternal snow High above all the rest we see the white peaks standing out in the blue sky, catching the first rays of the rising sun, the last rays of the sun as it departs. They are not the rounded hills which can be climbed by every one. They are not a range of extinct volcanoes, from which all fire has departed ; they are the same always whenever we see them. Such are the Beatitudes. High above all earthly ordinary virtues, they tower into the heaven itself. They are white with the snows of eternity. And when the shades of sickness and sorrow gather round us, when other common characters become cold and dead, then these higher points stand out brighter and brighter ; the glow of daylight can be seen reflected on their summits when it has vanished everywhere beside' (p. 101).

These sermons were written for children. Like many other books written for children, they will certainly appeal to grown-up people. The preface tells us that they have been found to interest many young persons. We trust they may. We must own we have great difficulty in discovering what young persons like, and are very sceptical about some of these sermons.

We have not thought it necessary to touch upon the inevitable deficiencies. Why do a certain class of writers always quote all the stories about St. John except that which is best authenticated (see Sermon II.) ? Is there not something to be said for zeal for 'truth' ?

*Festina Lente. A Sermon preached at Liskeard before the Ven. Archdeacon Hobhouse and the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Deaneries of East and West in the Diocese of Truro.* By the Rev. JULIAN MORETON, Vicar of Saltash. (Plymouth and Truro : W. F. Westcott.)

THIS is a sermon well adapted for a day in which faith in God is weak and faith in self is strong. To be quietly recalled to first principles is very wholesome for us, when, as now, mere haste assumes to be real and substantial progress. Mr. Moreton compares some of the features of the age with a less pretentious but more solid past, and warns us that we are drifting with the stream rather than breasting it. In a modest but firm and clear manner he reminds us that 'there may be a great deal of hurry without any real gain,' and that 'we should probably get on the faster by sometimes waiting awhile.' And we think he proves that the old principle 'slow and sure' has great need to be reasserted at present in regard of ministerial work. 'The husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it,' as St. James tells us, in his very practical epistle.

The *world* of this generation is in great haste about everything, as we all know. The *Church*, however, if in a healthy frame, has nothing in common with this spirit. For the difference between them is vast. It is the difference between the natural and the supernatural, between a kingdom in which the prince of this world bears present rule, and an eternal kingdom whose Head is in heaven. Mr. Moreton presses the need of a certain reverent privacy rather than the habit of advertizing restlessly in newspapers and parish magazines

as if to be seen of men, and he reminds us that there may well be more thought taken of 'the fire which by and by must try every man's work of what sort it is.' 'There may be,' he says, 'painful unrest where there is no profitable activity.'

He contrasts the solid religious reading of our fathers with the abundant literature of fiction by which religious teaching is supposed now to be inculcated, 'the lessons of faith and duty being disguised, and covertly conveyed, and the pill gilded.' Solemn truths, for the sake of indolent or dissipated minds, are nowadays studiously made entertaining, and a 'Bible for children' is among our latest discoveries. This method of watering down, as he observes, was never our Lord's way, however unpalatable the facts might be to the hearers, and it certainly was not the Apostolic way. Sickly sweets, the tale of fiction, and the amusing narrative, have largely taken the place of the plain and solid food upon which our more sturdy forefathers were reared. He sums up this part of his subject, as he well may do, by noticing the growing disuse of the Bible as a book of study.

Speaking of ministerial work in some very thoughtful words, he complains that we have petty systems of our own for it.

'We have,' he says, 'special machinery, a Society, or a Brotherhood, or a League, I don't wish to specify one such organization more than another, I therefore avoid naming any. Is not this empirical treatment of the soul's sickness an instance of the unwise haste which the text condemns? It tends greatly to obscure the doctrine of grace, and weakens the force of the baptismal vow. It teaches a sinner to undertake some new self-chosen obligation, instead of convicting him of broken vows and despite done to the Spirit of Grace. Instead of recalling him to the bonds of the baptismal covenant, it teaches him to deem himself free to *adopt* some pledge, or to *decline* it.'

And he adds :

'As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And we must have patience to work upward from that first principle. Till the evil is eradicated we must diligently apply the one corrective remedy which the Church gives us. She knows nothing of our many modern inventions. St. Paul's one specific is, Be ye holy, for God is holy. Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost? Your members are the members of Christ. Ye are not your own. This is the general and all-availing principle applicable to those who in baptism have been made members of Christ, children of God, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.'

This sermon, published in a cheap form, will well repay perusal. We seem to be accumulating human methods for religious work in our day, the result, as one must fear, of want of faith, and of forgetfulness of the real functions and gifts of the Christian Church.

*Sunlight and Shadow in the Christian Life.* By W. J. KNOX-LITTLE, M.A. (London : Rivingtons, 1889.)

SERMONS by preachers such as Canon Knox-Little—preachers whose gifts of voice and delivery are so conspicuous—must, like the speeches

of the greatest orators, lose much by publication. Words which have been brought home to us by the ringing voice and the earnest manner seem tame and flat when we read them. We do not say this in any disparagement of the sermons, but we wish to emphasize both their merits and defects. It is well known by this time that we must not expect, and shall not find in them, either deep theological thought, or a strong backbone of reasoning power, and for this reason we cannot recommend them to the theological student. So far we are saying what many have learnt to recognize ; but we wish to characterize clearly their merits. We ask any one of our readers to turn to page 156, and to read the passage on 'care,' and picture to himself some poor listener in the congregation, worn out with care, to whom every word would come home. She would feel, here was one who had learnt to sympathize with her and would preach what would appeal to her, and then would come a statement, in simple if vague tones, of the truths of Christianity and the consoling words of Christ. If some of those, who are only too ready to rail at the inadequacy of sermons which from a critical point of view appear too rhetorical, would but imitate and take to heart the merits of such a book as this, they might bring home the truths of Christianity to many who can understand simple teaching and who yearn for human sympathy.

#### BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, &c.

In an ordinary way, School Books, or what too modestly profess to be only School Books, would not come in for a notice at our hands. But we feel bound to make an exception in favour of *A History of England for the use of Schools and Colleges*, by E. J. Webb, formerly junior student of Christ Church, Oxford (London : Allmann & Son). Instead of the jejune fashion and ponderous style in which most school histories serve up their serried masses of facts and dates, we find here an easy flow of good English, jewelled here and there with apt quotations which brighten up the page, and which show that the author is a man of scholarly culture. If we were asked to select the portion most agreeable to read—as it must certainly have been the most difficult to write—we should name the last two chapters, headed *Queen Victoria* and *Modern England* respectively. Times so near our own are not readily brought into perspective. We cannot get far enough off to see them properly. But Mr. Webb has succeeded with singular adroitness in escaping a tendency far too common, to undue exultation over the boasted 'progress of the age,' and concludes a page of real eloquence—the last in the volume—with the following wise and weighty words of warning : 'Mere numbers will not enable us to hold the place we have won in the world, unless we act up to the light we have, and the faith we profess, as well as our fathers did ; and whether we shall do so or not cannot yet be foretold by anyone. It is for future ages, not for ourselves, to answer the question, but it depends on ourselves only, and on each of us, to determine what the

answer will be' (p. 608). One little slip we observe in these two chapters. Sir Robert Peel was not 'the first to put on the Income Tax.' It was put on by Mr. Pitt at the end of the last century, at the suggestion of Watson, Bishop of Llandaff. We cordially commend this admirable volume, which we doubt not will meet with a wider circle of readers than that to which it is addressed.

Among New Editions a foremost place must be given to the *Variorum Reference Bible* (London : Eyre & Spottiswoode). The superiority of this edition can only be duly appreciated by placing it side by side with the edition of 1880. The larger type is a great advantage, and the quality of the paper and general 'get-up' deserve unstinted praise. The Notes range themselves under two heads, Variations of *Rendering*, and Variations of *Reading*. The amount of labour and of learning which must have been lavished on both these heads is enough to take away one's breath. In the case of the Old Testament, not less than ninety commentators and fourteen versions have been ransacked to yield results which perhaps, after all the labour spent, are embodied in one line. In the New Testament, seventy-eight commentators, ancient and modern, six versions, twenty-three manuscripts, and twenty critical editions have undergone a similar process. It would carry us far beyond the limits of these 'Brief Notes'—and even of an entire Article—if we were to examine the merits of some of the conclusions so tersely stated in the *Various Readings* and *Various Renderings*. Among the latter we are surprised to see no notice taken of the Septuagint version of Habakkuk ii. 11, where the Septuagint has the κάρθαπος, or 'beetle out of the timber,' instead of the 'beam' of the A.V. The origin of this reading we have never seen accounted for. The scholars who have been thus laboriously employed on the Old Testament are Professors Cheyne and Driver ; on the New Testament, Professors Goodwin and Sanday, and the Rev. R. L. Clarke.

Dr. Eales is ambitious, and Mr. John Hodges is enterprising. We congratulate both of them on the very important addition now being made to the *Catholic Standard Library* of the *Life and Works of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux*, edited by Dom John Mabillon, translated and edited with Additional Notes by Samuel J. Eales, M.A., D.C.L., sometime Principal of St. Boniface College, Westminster. Vols. I. and II. containing the 'Letters of St. Bernard' (London : John Hodges, 1889.) We say Dr. Eales is ambitious, for a translation of the complete works of St. Bernard, though projected, circa 1844, by the Rev. F. Oakley and the Rev. J. S. Brewer, has never yet been attempted in English, and we know from experience that to render the Latin of St. Bernard—especially the mystical portion of his works—is a task of no ordinary difficulty. In pouring an exceedingly volatile fluid from one vessel to another much of the aroma is apt to evaporate, even if the fluid itself be not actually spilt. And to this process the translation of the *Sermons on the Canticles* may be compared. Vols. I. and II., however, do not take us beyond the Epistles, 780 in number. So far as we have compared them, in passages taken at random, the translation seems to

us to be very creditably done. But the subsequent volumes will be the crucial test. We wish Dr. Eales and his publisher all success in what may well be called a noble undertaking.

Five dainty volumes of a series entitled *Library of Spiritual Works for English Catholics* (London : Rivingtons, 1890) will meet a large and ever present want, and, we doubt not, command a proportionately large sale. They comprise 'new translations' of *St. Augustine's Confessions*, of the *Imitation of Christ*, of Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*, and of St. Francis de Sales' *Devout Life* and *Love of God*. We should be sorry to set up our judgment against that of the able and accomplished translators of these volumes, among whom we find such well-known names as H. L. Sidney Lear and the Rev. W. H. Hutchins ; but we confess to an uncomfortable feeling when we read of 'terms and expressions' held to be 'un-English,' being 'reduced to their equivalents in Anglican phraseology and belief.' To use a common phrase, we prefer the genuine article.

*The Life of Justification. A Series of Lectures*, by the Rev. George Body, D.D., Canon of Durham (London : Rivingtons, 1890), is another dainty volume, with which all who heard them many years ago at All Saints', Margaret Street, will be glad to refresh their memories. We trust they may be followed, and that speedily, by similar editions of subsequent courses of the *All Saints'* Lectures, which certainly will not lose by comparison with the present volume. For Canon Body has, to our thinking, gained enormously in style and depth and power since he went to Durham.

In the *Second series*, just issued, of the *Oxford House Papers* (London : Rivingtons, 1890) the Essay which will probably at the first blush attract the greatest attention as the eye runs down the list of contents is one on *Evolution and Christianity* by the Rev. Aubrey L. Moore. Readers, however, who sift the volume more carefully will find themselves riveted by Dean Church's thoughts on the *Christian Church*, thoughts which are for all time, and so will outlast this or that scientific theory which holds the field, till supplanted by another. For scientific theories cannot have any claim to that finality which belongs to Theology, the Queen of the sciences.

We have received from the S.P.C.K. *The Churchman's Almanack*, 1890, in bindings and sizes suited to all tastes, and at prices suited to all pockets ; *The Churchman's Pocket-Book*, 1890, and *The Churchman's Remembrancer*, with a very convenient arrangement for blotting-paper. We have also *The Churchman's Almanack for 1890 for use in the Prayer-Desk*. Perhaps if it were so used more frequently we should not be so often subjected to the annoyance of hearing the wrong Lesson read in church. We recommend the S.P.C.K. to prefix to this edition of their *Almanack* directions how to give out the Lessons. They have only to copy them from the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, to which many of the Clergy seem to pay no attention. It is constantly forgotten in giving out the Second Lesson that the words '*Holy Gospel*' are reserved by the Rubric for the *Gospel* for the day.

A  
Ame  
vie  
98  
the  
Sta  
wh  
Te  
Sta  
bet  
Fed  
cal  
105  
of P  
cial  
elec  
the  
mou  
114  
'ma  
elec  
119  
in t  
futu  
wha  
Am  
tion  
122.  
Ancien  
pros  
Rivi  
Apo  
124  
mean  
Nica  
Cour  
Epho  
Chal  
St. L  
twen  
case  
Libe

BAR  
H  
three  
requi  
ment  
terist

## INDEX TO VOL. XXIX.

### ADD

**A**DDINGTON, Lord, death of, 225  
*American Commonwealth*, the (review of Mr. James Bryce's work), 98 *sqq.*; its merits and faults, 98; the constitution of the United States, 100; political system by which the various States and Territories are governed, 101; State sovereignty, 102; conflicts between the State and the Federal authorities, 104; political parties and the presidency, 105; the Senate, 107; the House of Representatives, 108; the judicial system, 110; frequency of elections to public offices, 112; the 'spoils' system, 113; enormous extent of party patronage, 114; the Tweed Ring, 115; the 'machine,' 116; the presidential election, 117; the judicial bench, 119; unique position of America in the history of nations, 120; future of the Commonwealth, 121; what light does the experience of America afford towards the solution of European social problems, 122.

Ancient Church history, a Roman proselyte on, 122 *sqq.*; Mr. Luke Rivington's works, 122; the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem, 124; what Papal infallibility means, 125; the Council of Nicea, *ib.*; the Second General Council, 126; the Council of Ephesus, 127; the Council of Chalcedon, 128; the 'Tome of St. Leo,' 129; the truth about the twenty-eighth canon, 131; the case of Apriarius, 133; cases of Liberius and Honorius I., 134.

**B**ARING-GOULD, Mr., and the Holy Eucharist in the first three centuries, 355 *sqq.*; some requirements for the advancement of liturgiology, 355; characteristics of Mr. Baring-Gould's

### CAC

book, 358; the *Apostolical Constitutions*, 365; method by which the author proposes to arrive at an 'Apostolic Liturgy,' 368; the real starting-point for such an inquiry, 370; another fixed point the Greek and Syriac texts of the Liturgy of St. James, 372; the Anaphora, 376; the Institution and the Invocation, 377; the Great Intercession, 381; the Lord's Prayer, 382; Communion and Post-Communion, 383; how Mr. Baring-Gould deals with the period from the Institution to St. Justin Martyr, *ib.*

Beard, Rev. Arthur, *Faith: Active and Passive; Divine and Human*, 233.

Belser, Prof., *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlung über Laktantius*, 502  
Bevan, Canon, *History of Diocese of St. Davids*, 507  
Birks, Rev. H. A., *St. Peter*, 512  
Brett, Robert, *Life and Work* (review of Rev. Dr. T. W. Belcher's work), 425 *sqq.*; solidity of his character, 425; Church questions the great business of his life, 426; advocacy of the 'Sarum use,' 427; discourages disobedience to authority, 428; pleads for toleration, 429; opinion on evils of 'Congregationalism,' 431 *sq.*; censure of religious bazaars, 434; attitude towards brotherhoods, 435; bright faith shown in his life and actions, 437

Bridgett, Rev. T. E., *Blessed John Fisher*, 508; *Catholic Hierarchy deposed by Q. Elizabeth*, 508; *Ritual of New Testament*, 510

Bright, Rev. Canon W., *The Incarnation as a Motive Power*, 227.

**C**ACHEMAILE, Rev. E. P., *Church Sunday School Handbook*, 511

## CAR

- Carter, Rev. T. T., *Spiritual Instructions*, 245  
 Church, Rev. A. J., *Henry V*, 514  
 Churton, Bishop, *The Island Missionary of the Bahamas*, 241  
 Clarendon's History of the Rebellion (review of Mr. Macray's edition), 30 *sqq.*; improvements on Dr. Bandinel's edition, 30; old spellings restored, 31; the preface and dedications, 33; the original copyright, *ib.*; alterations made by Clarendon's sons, *ib.*; Anthony à Wood fined for imputations against Clarendon after his death, 34; the first edition, *ib.*; the only French translation, 36; the Sutherland Collection, *ib.*; Kennett's notes to a copy in the Bodleian Library, 37; the Oxford edition of 1717, 38; Mr. Gardiner's admiration of Clarendon's work, 38; Mr. Forster's attack, 39; partisanship in an historian, 40; the character of the war, 41; Clarendon's share in it, 43; his fairness towards Digby, 44; his bitterness against the Scotch, 45; his judgment of Cromwell, *ib.*; his familiarity with Machiavelli, 46; his inaccuracies, 47; his excellences in sketching character, 48; does not spare the faults of Charles I., *ib.*  
 Corbett, Julian, *Monk*, 514  
 Creighton, Professor M., *Cardinal Wolsey*, 250

- DAWSON, Sir J. W., *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, 522  
 Derry, Bishop of, *The Epistles of St. John*, 487  
 Duchesn , Abb  L., *Origines du Culte Chr tien*, 498  
 Durham, Bishop of, *Apostolic Fathers*, part ii., 520

- EDUCATION Code, the new, 159 *sqq.*; its disregard of the Commissioners' recommendations, 160; amount of space for each child attending school, 161; the rule relating to the building of schools by volunteers, 163; transfer of voluntary schools to

## FAT

- school boards, 164; the question concerning the Government grant, 166; the proposal for establishing day training colleges, 168; opposition to the Code, 169; statements of the Vice-President of the Education Department, 170; Lord Cranborne's speech, 171; advice for the future, 172; amount of help to be given to elementary schools, 173  
 English Liturgical Colours (review of works by Bishop of Salisbury, W. St. John Hope, &c.), 453 *sqq.*; early liturgical use of symbolic colours, 454; symbolical use of colours in the Church of England since the Reformation, 455; reason for a sequence of colours, 456; white practically the Lenten colour in mediæval England, 457; English Sunday colours, 459; Bishop of Salisbury's adaptation of the old Sarum sequence, 460; Lincoln sequence derived from Rouen, 461; sequence of Exeter, 461; Truro sequence borrowed from Jewish liturgical colours, 462; adoption of foreign customs, 464  
*Eucharist, the Holy, Aids to reverently celebrating*, 237  
 Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentary on Pauline and Catholic Epistles*, 503

- FATHERS, Lives of the (review of Archdeacon Farrar's work), 400 *sqq.*; Basil's description of the scenery of Pontus, 402; some of Dr. Farrar's inaccuracies, 404; his misstatements concerning the epistles of Clement of Rome, *ib.*; his unwise use of the word 'Gnostic,' 405; his account of Montanism, 406; his controversial spirit, 407; an instance from the life of Polycarp, *ib.*; his unhistorical method instanced in his treatment of monasticism, 408; his blindness to the good side of the institution, 409; Mr. Lecky's different spirit, *ib.*; Dr. Farrar's want of a clear grasp of scientific theology exemplified in his statement about semi-Pela-

## FER

- gianism, 410; an inconsistency in his treatment of the theology of Irenaeus, 411; his propositions concerning the Church, 412; his references to Irenaeus and Clement as believers in an invisible Church, 413; his condemnation of Augustine's theology, 416; sense in which Origen used the word 'Church,' 417; Dr. Farrar's attack on tradition, 418; on episcopacy, and especially its foremost supporter Cyprian, 420; his treatment of the opinions of the Fathers, 422  
 Ferguson, R. S., *History of Diocese of Carlisle*, 507  
 Fraser, the late Bishop, *Sermons* (two vols., ed. Rev. J. W. Diggle), 239  
 Freeman, E. A., *William the Conqueror*, 250

- GAIRDRNER, James, *Henry VII*, 250  
 Galton, Arthur, *Thomas Cromwell*, 508  
 Geikie, Dr. Cunningham, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, 522  
 Gratacap, L. P., *Philosophy of Ritual*, 510  
 Green, Mrs. J. R., *Henry II*, 250

- HARRISON, the late Arch-deacon, *Patient Waiting*, 230  
 Harrison, Frederic, *Oliver Cromwell*, 250  
 Hole, Rev. Charles, *A Manual of the Book of Common Prayer*, 242  
 Hoole, Charles H., *The Classical Element in the New Testament considered as a Proof of its Genuineness*, 501  
 Hooper, George, *Wellington*, 514  
 Hughes, T., *Livingstone*, 514  
 Humphrey, the late Rev. W. G., *The Godly Life*, 247

- INFALLIBILITY, Roman (review of Dr. Salmon's Lectures), 1 *sqq.*; the greatest obstacle to Christian union, 2; causes of declining interest in the controversy, 3; methods of inquiry and controversy, *ib.*; cardinal impor-

## JES

- tance of the question, 4; traditional doctrine, 5; Cardinal Newman's theory of development, 6; acceptance of the doctrine of Infallibility an act of private judgment, 7; the 'Grammar of Assent,' 8; modern Roman opinions about Bossuet, 9; teaching office of the Church, 10; her sources of proof, 11; function of tradition in the exegesis of Scripture, 12; Rome does not believe in her own infallibility, 13; blunders of the infallible guide in the Vulgate of Sixtus V. and the case of Galileo, 15; the Gallican theory that infallibility lodges in the dispersive Church, 16; logical consequences of development, 17; General Councils, 19; the Vatican Council, 20; Dr. Salmon's disbelief in the joint episcopacy of Peter and Paul, 23; consecration oath of the Latin bishops, *ib.*; an illustration of development from the history of the United States, 24; canons of the Council of Sardica, *ib.*; devices for explaining away *ex cathedra* utterances of the Popes, 25; the temporal power, 26; the False Decretals, 27

- Ireland, *The Educational Work of the Church of* (review of Rev. H. K. Moore's and other works), 437 *sqq.*; 'Charter schools,' 438; limited Government aid to voluntary schools, 439; 'Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland,' 440; National Board of Education, 441; Church Education Society established, 442; difficulties of Church schools in competing with Board schools, 443; Church of Ireland Training College, 444; Board of Religious Education, 446; Diocesan Boards of Education, 448 *sqq.*; teaching of theology at Divinity School and Trinity College, 453

- JENNINGS, Rev. A. C., *A Manual of Church History*, 242  
 Jessopp, Rev. Dr. A., *Arcady and The Coming of the Friars*, 509

J.F.

J. F., *Story of Church of England*, 505

**K** NOX-LITTLE, Canon, *Sunlight and Shadow*, 527  
Kurtz, Professor, *Church History*, vol. ii. (trans. Rev. John Macpherson), 233

**L** IDDON, Rev. Canon, *Christmase in St. Paul's*, 228  
Linklater, Dr., *Sunday and Recreation*, 511

'Low Church' Party, *Annals of the* (review of Rev. W. H. B. Proby's work), 308 sqq.; the 'Reformation' in England, 309; the first race of Evangelicals, *ib.*; the pious period, 310; polemical period, 311; the immoral period, 312; Mr. Proby's intemperate language, *ib.*; his sweeping assertions of the absence of piety outside the Evangelical circle, 313; his contention that Low Churchmen have no moral right to be in the Church of England, 315

**M** ACCOLL, Rev. Canon, *Christianity in Relation to Science and Morals*, 491

Maclear, Rev. Dr. G. F., *An Introduction to the Creeds*, 245

Mayor, Professor, *The Latin Hepateuch*, 495

Metropolitans and their jurisdiction, 137 sqq.; the Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case, 138; synods of bishops settled disputes concerning discipline and morals in the early Western Church, 140; and doctrinal cases in the East, 141; no bishop ever tried before a single judge in ante-Nicene times, 142; witness of the canons of councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, *ib.*; the canons of Nicaea, 143; of Antioch, 144; Archbishop Benson's deduction from the eleventh canon unwarranted, 149; the canons of Sardica, 150; the second canon of the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, 151; evidence of the sixth canon, 152;

NOV

the tendency towards centralization shown by later canons, 153  
Miller, Rev. G., *Historical Sketches of English Church*, 505

Moberly, R. C., *Sorrow, Sin, and Beauty*, 511

Monasticism, English in the sixteenth century, 386 sqq.; Mr. Gasquet's book, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*, 386; his sketch of the condition of things in the Church in the early days of Henry VIII, 387; grievances of the monks, 388; the accusations against the monks, 390; evidence of the Episcopal Registers of Norwich, 391; St. Mary's Priory, Wymondham, and the Priory of Westacre, *ib.*; St. Mary's, Walsingham, 392; Leicester Abbey, *ib.*; the monastery at Dorchester, 393; the rising in Lincolnshire, 394; the Pilgrimage of Grace, 396; the King's vengeance against the monks, 397; treachery among the monks, *ib.*; cruelty of ejecting the nuns, 398; Mr. Gasquet's statements about the disposal of the monastic lands, 399; the monastic system a hindrance to progress, 400

Moreton, Rev. J., *Festina Lente*, 526

Mortimer, Rev. Alfred G., *The Laws of Happiness*, 240

Moule, Rev. H. S. C., *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, 242

**N**EW TESTAMENT lexicography, 257 sqq.; anecdote showing the strangeness of New Testament Greek to a purely classical scholar, 258; influence of the Septuagint version exaggerated, 259; *ἀγαπή*, 262; Dr. Hatch's examples of Greek renderings of Hebrew words examined, 263; words considered peculiarly Hellenistic often found in profane and even strictly classical writers, 275; *μνηστήριον*, *ib.*; *οξιά θαύματος*, 278; the word 'Hosanna,' 279; proper names, 280; Dr. Field's notes on select passages, 281

Novels, three controversial, 338 sqq.; difficult task of a critic of

## OLI

modern fiction, 338 ; Mrs. Lee's *Faithful and Unfaithful*, 340 ; Mrs. Deland's *John Ward, Preacher*, 345 ; Olive Schreiner's *Story of an African Farm*, 348

**O**LIVIER, H. E., *Too many Bishops*, 513

**P**ARRY, E. W., *Epitome of Anglican Church History*, 505  
Pauperism, prevention of, 465 sqq. ; the position of the clergy with regard to, 465 ; Canon Blackley's proposals, 466 sqq. ; provision in early life against destitution in sickness and old age, 467 ; scheme of National Insurance, 468 sqq. ; advantages of a national fund, 469 ; effect upon improvident marriages, 470 sqq. ; compulsory providence, 471 ; method of collecting contributions, 473 ; 'National Providence League,' 474 ; Report of Parliamentary Committee, 474 ; opposition from Friendly Societies, 475 ; existing aids to thrift insufficient, 476 ; a national scheme not antagonistic to good voluntary thrift organizations, 477 ; opinions of Odd Fellows, 479 ; evidence of the Registrar of Friendly Societies before the Parliamentary Committee, 480 ; difficulties in the way of immediate realization of national insurance, 486

Poor, condition of the, at the East End of London, 195 sqq. ; the Royal Commission of 1838 on the state of the Church, 196 ; Mr. Mayhew's inquiries, 197 ; Mr. Booth's *Labour and Life of the People*, 198 ; constitution of the East-End population, 199 ; want of superior persons and its effects, 200 ; state of religious provision, ib. ; influence of past neglect, 201 ; the Brotherhood scheme of the Convocation Committee, 202 ; disappointing results of agencies already at work, ib. ; East-End clubs, 204 ; influence of public houses, ib. ; housing, 205 ; immigration to the labour

## SCO

market, (1) from the provinces, 206 ; (2) from abroad, 209 ; scene on the arrival of a Hamburg boat, ib. ; character of the Jewish immigrants, 210 ; manner in which the East-enders gain their livelihood, 211 ; the Dock labourers, 213 ; the strike, 214 ; other classes, 216 ; Mr. Booth's classification according to earnings, 219 ; the trades in which 'sweating' is employed, ib. ; elements of social happiness, 221 ; Mr. Booth's proposal of State interference, 222 ; the true remedy, 224

*Prophets, Minor, a Plain Commentary on the*, 231

**R**USSELL, the late Dean, *The Light that Lighteth every Man*, 246  
Russell, W. C., *Dampier*, 514

**S**ADLER, Rev. M. F., (1) *The First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*; (2) *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, and Philippians*, 230  
Sandford, Bp., *Pastoral Letter*, 512  
Sandford, Mrs. Henry, *Thomas Poole and his Friends*, 247  
Scottish Liturgy, proposed changes in the, 49 sqq. ; interesting features in the history of the Scottish Church, 49 ; the Scottish Communion Office and its various editions, 50 ; the Pastoral Letter of the Scottish Bishops, 53 ; degradation of the Scottish Office by the Synod of 1863, 54 ; the Bishops' opinion on the form of Invocation, 56 ; the 'Scottish Communion Office' to be called the 'Scottish Liturgy,' 58 ; prefatory rubrics, 59 ; the Ten Commandments, ib. ; new Collects, 60 ; whence these are derived, 61 ; new post-communion thanksgiving, 63 ; the words 'Thus endeth the Holy Gospel,' ib. ; changes of punctuation in the Nicene Creed, 64 ; new offertory sentences, 65 ; 'offerings' instead of 'oblations,' ib. ; Prefaces for seasons and feasts, 67 ; enlargement of the

## STA

*Sanctus*, 68; the Prayer of Consecration, 69; the post-communion address recast in the form of a thanksgiving, 70; reservation for the sick, 71; assensation of the celebrant, 288; position of the table and of the celebrant, 289; collect for the Queen superseded, 290; mixture of water with the wine, 291; suggestions for improving the new proper Prefaces, 292; reconstruction of the Epiklesis, 293; the collects from the 'Book of Deer,' 306

Stanley, Dean, *Sermons for Children*, 525

Symbolism, Christian, 174 *sqq.*; independent of artistic execution, as shown by mediaeval representations, 175; its purpose not historical but religious, 176; pictures used as means of instruction by St. Paulinus of Nola and Benedict Biscop, *ib.*; St. John Damascene's opinion, 177; M. Didron's *Christian Iconography*, 178; Miss Twining's *Symbols and Emblems of Early and Mediaeval Christian Art*, *ib.*; symbolical animals, 179; Mr. Romilly Allen's *Rhind Lectures*, 182; Miss Stokes's completion of Didron's work, 183; stereotyped forms prescribed by the early Church, 184; subjects of the earliest examples in the catacombs, 185; scheme of arrangement, 188; examples of the same subjects in Ireland and Great Britain, *ib.*; the Crucifixion, 192; the Descent from the Cross, 193

TEMPLE, Sir R., *Lord Lawrence*, 514

Traill, H. D., *William III.*, 250  
Truth-seeking, methods of, 317 *sqq.*; Mr. St. George Mivart's book *On Truth*, 317; idealism, 319; realism, 321; the Duke of Argyll's book *What is Truth?* 323; the Rev. Mr. Rivington's

## YON

*Dependence*, 324; his claims to possess truth in a way incomprehensible to Anglicans, 325; the search for truth a department of morals, 327; Dr. Salmon's lectures on *Infallibility*, 330; Mr. Aubrey Moore's *Essays on Science and the Faith*, 336  
Twells, Canon, *Colloquies on Preaching*, 510  
*Twelve Hundred Questions on the History of England*, 505

WARD, William George, and the Oxford movement (review of Mr. Wilfrid Ward's work), 72 *sqq.*; birth and boyhood of, 74; his career at Oxford, 75; influence of Dr. Whately, 77; and of Dr. Arnold, 78; early history of the Oxford movement, 80; sketch of Mr. Ward's character, 82; his real relation to the movement, 85; Tract No. 90, Mr. Newman's account of its origin, 86; Mr. Ward's defence of the Tract, 88; his articles in the *British Critic*, 89; his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, 90; feeling produced by it at Oxford, 92; Mr. Ward condemned by the University, 94; announces his approaching marriage immediately after, 95; secedes into the Church of Rome, *ib.*; the 'collapse of the Oxford movement' an incorrect expression, 96; Mr. Ward's influence upon religious thought, 97

Weiss, Dr. Bernhard, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii. (trans. A. J. K. Davidson), 235

Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., *The Spiritual Life and other Sermons*, 243

Williams, Dr. (Bishop of Connecticut), *Studies in the Book of Acts*, 232

YONGE, Rev. J. E., *An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed*, 242

aims to  
incom-  
s, 325 ;  
partment  
Salmon's  
, 330 ;  
says on

5

les on

s on the

age, and  
ent (re-  
Ward's  
and boy-  
eer at  
of Dr.  
Arnold,  
Oxford  
of Mr.  
his real  
nt, 85 ;  
ewman's  
6 ; Mr.  
act, 88 ;  
*Critic*,  
*Christian*  
roduced  
r. Ward  
iversity,  
aching  
ter, 95 ;  
f Rome,  
Oxford  
express-  
fluence

7  
*Manual*  
*v Testa-*  
J. K.

*e Spir-i-*  
*ermons,*

Connec-  
Book of

*n Expos-*  
*s' Creed,*